STATUS INCONSISTENCY AND POLITICAL ATTITUDES

A Thesis presented in the Department of
Psychology and Sociology
University of Canterbury

In partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts

by Leslie B. Gray

November 1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In modern democratic society it is not unusual for a person to experience status inconsistency. It is in keeping with our ideal of equality of opportunity that a person can raise his social status according to his ability. For example, by developing special skills a person can raise his level in one area of his life without necessarily affecting the other areas. We take for granted the inconsistency between educational achievement and income for school teachers, and in the case of politicians the inconsistency between education and power.

Let us consider occupation, income and education to be important status hierarchies in our society. A person whose ranks are equal, or nearly equal, on all three hierarchies is status consistent. The three equal ranks can be at a high level, or at a low level, or somewhere in the middle. An inconsistent pattern is the result of ranking appreciably higher, or lower, in one status hierarchy than in the other two, or of having distinctly different ranks in each of the three hierarchies. This multidimensional view of social stratification in which an individual is simultaneously ranked on

several status hierarchies introduces a new variable--the consistency of status ranks.

Status consistency has been studied in different kinds of situations. The major authors start from the premise that the concept reflects relationships in society which do matter--do affect people's behavior. Presumably a status consistent person is satisfied with his situation. He looks about him and finds that others respond to him in a consistent and predictable fashion. On the other hand, if a person can be characterized by inconsistent status ranks, he stands in a position of ambiguity. To some he is a superior, while he must speak with deference to others. This stressful situation may lead to a feeling of frustration and relative deprivation. It is because of this difference in outlook between the consistent and inconsistent individuals that we look for some difference in behavior patterns.

Status consistency has been studied by social psychologists and sociologists under a variety of names--status congruence, status integration, status crystallization. It has been compared to different kinds of behavior--social participation, aggression, suicide, symptoms of mental stress, preference for change in power distribution, and political attitudes. The

present study is concerned with the relationship between the consistency of status ranks and political attitudes.

The findings of the empirical studies on status consistency and its relationship to political attitudes have not been in agreement. These conflicting findings indicated the usefulness of further study and led to the decision to do a partial replication study with data from New Zealand and Canada.

Anderson and Zelditch affirm confidence in the usefulness of further study:

> We believe that a formal theory of considerable explanatory power can eventually be developed to account for the phenomenon we have called rank equilibration and which other people have called "status congruence" or "status crystallization". This theory will then include status politics as a special case.[1]

The main body of the thesis is divided into further chapters as follows: Chapter II, "Theoretical Considerations and Former Research", discusses the multidimensional nature of stratification and the interrelatedness of status positions. Inconsistency is considered in relation to traditional and modern societies, and vertical mobility. Discussion of choice of suitable hierarchies includes

---

[1] Bo Anderson and Morris Zelditch, "Rank Equilibration and Politics", European Journal of Sociology, 5:112, 1964.

occupation as a determiner of status and the importance of ascribed and achieved status characteristics. Former studies related to status inconsistency and political attitudes are summarized and their findings discussed.

In Chapter III, "Methodological Considerations", the "location" of inconsistency in the individual, in a social relation, or in a group is discussed. Several problems of measurement are considered. They are: 1) choice of hierarchies, 2) assigning status rank to women, 3) proportions of consistency and inconsistency, 4) defining liberalism-conservatism, and 5) method of multivariate analysis.

Chapter IV, "The Empirical Studies" is divided into three major parts. Part A, Introduction, describes the secondary analyses, the decision to use objective indicators, the Jackson method for measuring status consistency, hypotheses, and tests of significance employed. Part B, Dunedin Central, reports on the first empirical study. Information about the sample, measuring status consistency, and measuring political attitudes is included. The analysis of the data reports the important cross tabulations and the results of the tests of significance. Conclusions end the section. Part C,

Canadian Survey, reports on the second empirical study. This section covers the same basic topics as mentioned above for Dunedin Central.

Chapter V, "Conclusions", deals with conclusions, some possible explanations, and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT AND FORMER RESEARCH

THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT

The multidimensional nature of ranking individuals in society has been well recognized by sociologists. Western industrial society holds a number of attributes to be important in the evaluation of its members and groups. Max Weber described three major variables which form the core of stratification in society: 1) possession of economic goods and skills, and opportunities for income within the market situation, 2) prestige or social honor, and 3) access to political power.[1]

Talcott Parsons describes a classification of bases of differential valuation which he considers to be relatively concrete and useful. The bases of valuation he defines are:

1. Membership in a kinship unit.
2. Personal qualities (These include such qualities as beauty, intelligence, strength, age, sex).
3. Achievements (Achievements are valued results of the actions of individuals. They may or may not be embodied in material objects).
4. Possessions (Possessions are things, not necessarily material objects, "belonging" to an individual which are distinguished by the criterion of transferability).

---

[1] H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, p.180-194.

5. Authority (An institutionally recognized right to influence the actions of others).

6. Power. (In this classification a person possesses power only in so far as his ability to influence others and his ability to achieve or to secure possessions are not institutionally sanctioned.)[1]

Closely related to evaluation is social ranking. Society ranks its members according to the qualities or characteristics that it values most. This placing of individuals in positions of superiority and inferiority is basic to the development of status hierarchies.

> By a hierarchy we mean a number of individuals ordered on an inferiority-superiority scale with respect to the comparative degree of which they possess or embody some socially approved or generally desired attribute or characteristic. A hierarchal position is thus always a position in which one individual is identified with others with regard to the possession or embodiment of some common characteristic, but differentiated from these others in the degree, or measure, to which that characteristic is possessed or embodied.[2]

Benoit-Smullyan names three fundamental hierarchies in modern society: the economic hierarchy, the political hierarchy, and the prestige hierarchy. These are essentially the same as those described by Weber.

---

[1] Talcott Parsons, "An Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification", in Essays in Sociological Theory, p.75-76.

[2] Emile Benoit-Smullyan, "Status, Status Types and Status Interrelations", American Sociological Review, 9:151, April, 1944.

Relative position within each of these hierarchies constitutes economic status, political status, and prestige status. These statuses provide objective indices of the individual's location in most societies.[1] An individual's position on the various hierarchies may be at about the same level or at distinctly different levels depending on a number of factors, including whether the society is democratic or traditional.

"Closed" and "Open" Societies

In the traditional or "closed" society high ranking attributes such as wealth, opportunity, elaborate life style, and prestige cluster around a single individual or group. The enjoyment of this high status position is largely determined by birth or lineage, these status characteristics being almost all ascribed. Similarly in the low status groups, individuals lack wealth, opportunity and prestige and live in conditions of poverty. It is difficult if not impossible for an individual to move out of his own group, be it class or caste.

Barber[2] describes various stratification systems showing the variations on the traditional model: the Indian caste society, the two broadly inclusive social classes of the Chinese (the leisured gentry group and the

---

[1] Benoit-Smullyan, loc. cit.

[2] Bernard Barber, Social Stratification, A Comparative Analysis of Structure and Process p.80-86.

peasantry), the nobles and non-noble groups of Medieval Europe, the three "estates" of Eighteenth Century France.

In an "open" society, common in the modern industrial period, the distribution of status among individuals will be characteristically different than in the "closed" society. Equality of opportunity is a valued goal in modern democratic society. Each person is supposed to have the opportunity to achieve a status position as high as his abilities will allow. A child from whatever circumstances can make his way into a high prestige position if he has the necessary intelligence and determination. The rewards of society--wealth, prestige, life chances--are given on the basis of ability. This opportunity to achieve a higher position means that the different status attributes do not form unbreakable clusters. This flexibility is in contrast to the interlocking of status hierarchies characteristic of traditional society.

In practice no society is completely "open" or "closed". That modern industrial society does not practice perfect equality of opportunity is common knowledge. Michael Young makes this point crystal clear in his book, The Rise of the Meritocracy,[1] in which he creates a society, an utopia if you will, where ability is the only criterion of evaluation and basis for advancement. This created

---

[1] Michael Young, The Rise of the Meritocracy.

society, built largely on trends in modern industrial society, illustrates how far we are from our ideal of equality of opportunity and the ridiculous and unfortunate situation which would exist if this ideal were carried out in every detail.

Within the ideal of equality of opportunity lies an important contradiction. On the one hand, it states that all men are to be valued and have an equal chance for advancement. On the other hand the ideal recognizes the possibility and importance of rising on the status hierarchies within the society. If some can rise, there must be others left at the bottom.

It is in this type of "open" society, that there is much opportunity to experience status inconsistency. The existence of several major status hierarchies and this lack of linkage among the hierarchies leads to a situation in which it is not possible to characterize an individual's status position by a single rank.

The differences between the ranks may be especially frustrating when one hierarchy is related to an ascribed status (such as sex or race) and the other refers to an achieved status (such as education). A Negro in the United States may find it difficult to get a position in keeping with his university training. Thus the low rank on the ethnic hierarchy and the high rank on the education

hierarchy lead to frustration and uncertainty. The ambiguous position resulting from status inconsistency is described by Anderson and Zelditch[1] when they describe several hypothetical pairs. For example, take the case of Ego, whose income is $6000 per year and who has a white collar job, and Alter who has the same income and has a working class job. Ego may focus on their equal income saying to himself, "Alter may make as much money as I do but I have a better job." Or he may say, "If I have a better job than Alter, why don't I make more money?" The first reflection leads to a feeling of relative satisfaction, the second to relative deprivation. Ego's perception of how bad the second alternative is will depend in part, on what he expects his future earnings to be. If he is young he will anticipate an increase in earnings. If he is middle-aged, at the peak of his earning capacity, he may consider the situation unjust.

> If Ego finds his rank inconsistent in comparison with Alter he will get upset to the extent that he perceives that upward mobility in his lower rank(s) is blocked. If the situation is perceived to be transient then Ego is not likely to get upset.[2]

---

[1] Bo Anderson and Morris Zelditch, "Rank Equilibration and Politics", European Journal of Sociology, 5:112-125,1964.

[2] Ibid. p.118

Status Consistency related to Vertical Mobility

It seems reasonable that a person who is inconsistent as a result of having lost rank in one but not all of the status hierarchies would show different behavioral responses than someone who is inconsistent by virtue of having been upwardly mobile in one or two categories.[1]

According to Broom, status inconsistency plus a high degree of awareness of that inconsistency may lead a person to desire to be upwardly mobile.[2]

In an open or democratic society where vertical mobility is accessible, an individual, having raised his position in one status variable or hierarchy, will seek to raise his rank in one or more of the other hierarchies. This type of status inconsistency may be a result of incomplete mobility. As this process takes time, or may never be completed, the period during which one rank is substantially higher than the others may be prolonged.

This effort to raise one's rank in one hierarchy may come about as a result of individual action or of group action. The union is widely recognized as a group seeking

---

[1] Milton Bloombaum, "The Mobility Dimension in Status Consistency", Sociology and Social Research, 48:342, April 1964.

[2] Leonard Broom, "Social Differentiation and Stratification", in Sociology Today, Robert K. Merton et. al. editors, p.432.

to raise some aspect of status for its members. The effort may be directed toward a raise in wages or toward the general improvement of conditions such as shorter hours or provision of amenities. In a study of incongruity within occupations, Pellegrin and Bates state:

> Formation of strong occupational associations for purposes of status improvement reflects the existence of incongruity within an occupation. Usually members feel the functional importance of their occupation is greater than its prestige, authority or rewards. As the association improves one or more of the attributes it is as likely to create additional incongruity as to decrease the old.[1]

The concepts of vertical mobility and status inconsistency are closely linked. The prevalence of inconsistency is due largely to rising and falling within the different hierarchies.

Choosing Suitable Hierarchies

The attributes selected for determining consistency should be, as far as possible, indicators of positions used by society in distributing its rewards. These indicators may vary from society to society and from one period in time to another.

---

[1] Ronald J. Pellegrin and Fredrick L. Bates, "Congruity and Incongruity of Status Attributes within Occupations and Work Positions", Social Forces, 38:25, October 1959.

Achievement within an occupational system is basic to the determination of status in the American scale of stratification, according to Talcott Parsons.[1] In studies of mobility, occupational prestige is used as a single indicator of social status both in American investigations and international comparisons.[2]

Most of the empirical studies of status consistency have been carried out in the United States of America. In each case the investigator has selected three or four attributes which he considered to be central in the American stratification system. For example, Lenski used occupation, income, education, and ethnic background. Goffman used occupation, education and income. Those studies which include the racial or ethnic factor point up the relationship between ascribed and achieved status hierarchies. Ascribed and achieved attributes have a different relationship to consistency. To change one's position on an ascribed hierarchy such as race or sex is difficult or impossible. The individual will benefit or suffer from the evaluation that society places on his group whatever personal characteristics he may have. Conversely, achieved status positions are subject to change.

---

[1] Parsons, op. cit., p.79

[2] Seymour Martin Lipset and Reinhard Bendix, Social Mobility in Industrial Society; Alex Inkeles and Peter H. Rossi, "National Comparisons of Occupational Prestige", American Journal of Sociology, 61:329-39,1956; S.M. Miller, "Comparative Social Mobility", Current Sociology,9:1-89,1960.

Achievements generally depend in large part on ability and motivation. Learning new skills, getting more education, making more money, impressing others with special talents, these are activities that will improve a person's position on the achieved status hierarchies.

Those studies using all achieved statuses are giving special emphasis to the occupational hierarchy. Otis D. Duncan[1] points out the functional and temporal relationships of education, occupation and income as status attributes. The large majority of persons in the labor force have completed their education. Thus education may be considered in large measure as a preparation for the pursuit of an occupation. Likewise for most persons the bulk of income received consists of compensation for rendering services in their occupation. Income is received more or less simultaneously with the pursuit of an occupation -- in fact most of the income received from an occupational pursuit accrues subsequent to the entry into, and identification with, that occupation. Consideration of the various contingencies of actual work histories would enrich and complicate this simple model, but would not alter its basic relationships.

---

[1] Otis Dudley Duncan, "A Socioeconomic Index for All Occupations" in Occupations and Social Status by Albert J. Reiss, Jr., p.109-138.

FORMER RESEARCH

Gerhard Lenski

Gerhard Lenski was the first to seek a relationship between status consistency and political attitudes. Since this pioneering study a number of other investigators have sought to test his original hypothesis. Table I (on next page) lists the studies relevant to this research by date of publication. The findings of the subsequent studies were contradictory--some supported Lenski's hypothesis while others did not. In the following pages the relevant details of these differences will be given.

In his study, "Status Crystallization: A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status", Gerhard Lenski[1] describes four possible reactions to status inconsistency or low crystallization: 1) a reaction against the social order or a desire for a social change, 2) a reaction by blaming other individuals, 3) a reaction by blaming oneself, and 4) a reaction by withdrawing in such a manner as to diminish the frequency or seriousness of the socially disturbing experiences which arise as a result of status inconsistencies. It is the first of these reactions, a desire for social change, which he is testing by the following basic hypothesis:

---

[1] Gerhard E. Lenski, "Status Crystallization: A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status", American Sociological Review, 19:405-413, August 1954.

Table I

FORMER RELEVANT RESEARCH

Date of Publication	Author	Characteristics	Hierarchies Used
1954	Lenski	Compared status crystallization to political attitudes and voting behavior	Occupation Education Income Ethnic background
1956	Kenkel	Compared status consistency to politico-economic attitudes	Occupation Education Dwelling Area Prestige Rental value of Dwelling
1957	Goffman	Compared status consistency to preference for change in power distribution	Occupation Education Income
1962	Jackson	Compared status consistency with symptoms of stress	Occupation Education Racial-ethnic background
1965	Brandmeyer	Compared status consistency with political behavior	Occupation Education Ethnic group
1965	Schmitt	Compared status congruency of married women to political attitudes	Education Husband's income and Occupation
1966	Kelly and Chambliss	Compared status consistency and political attitudes	Occupation Education Income

> Individuals characterized by a low degree of status crystallization differ significantly in their political attitudes and behavior from individuals characterized by a high degree of status crystallization, when status differences in the vertical dimensions are controlled.[1]

In the elections of 1948 and 1950 the preference for the Democratic party on the part of the low crystallization group was found to be significant at the .03 and .01 levels respectively. In the 1952 election this tendency was recorded but not found to be significant. When the mean scores of each hierarchy were adjusted to control for status differences in the vertical dimensions, the margin of difference between the two crystallization categories was reduced but in the case of two out of the three (1948 and 1950) the difference remained statistically significant.

As another test of association between status crystallization and political attitudes respondents were asked their views on a) government sponsored health insurance program, b) price controls, and c) general extension of governmental powers. An expression of attitude in favour of any of the above was considered a liberal attitude. Favourable attitudes toward a) and c) were found more frequently in the low crystallization group (findings significant at .02 level). This

---

[1] Ibid p.405-6

association remained after the application of controls for differences in the four status hierarchies. On the question of price controls, results were in the same direction but not statistically significant.

The findings that persons in the low crystallization group favoured the Democratic party more frequently than the high crystallization group and that they had more liberal attitudes toward a government sponsored health insurance program and general extension of governmental powers led Lenski to conclude that political liberalism and low status crystallization are associated.

Lenski generalized these findings further to predict that the more frequently acute status inconsistencies occur within a population the greater would be the proportion of that population willing to support programs of social change.

Irwin Goffman[1]

Goffman used a very different approach for measuring consistency and selecting indicators for a desire for social change. He found that it was necessary to specify the conditions under which status consistency was associated with the desire for change in the distribution of power.

---

[1] Irwin W. Goffman, "Status Consistency and Preference for Change in Power Distribution", American Sociological Review, 22:275-281, June 1957.

The relationship appears to be related directly to stratum position. It is in the high occupation stratum that the inconsistents express the most desire for change. In the middle stratum the relationship still exists but it is less strong, while in the lowest occupation stratum the relationship almost disappears. Goffman suggested two interpretations: 1) that mobility and other modes of adjustment may account for the variation in the relationship and 2) that the measurement of status consistency did not take account of the simultaneous salience of status characteristics.

Elton Jackson[1]

Elton Jackson's study compared six sharply inconsistent patterns (education higher than occupation, education higher than racial-ethnic, occupation higher than education, occupation higher than racial-ethnic, racial-ethnic higher than education, racial-ethnic higher than occupation) to symptom level. It is here that he points out a relationship between his own data and the findings of Lenski regarding political liberalism. The patterns of sharp status inconsistency (racial-ethnic rank higher than occupation rank, and racial-ethnic rank higher than education rank)

---

[1] Elton F. Jackson, "Status Consistency and Symptoms of Stress", American Sociological Review, 27:469-480, August 1962.

which are associated with significantly large differences in symptom rates as compared to status consistency are only associated with small differences, if any, in political liberalism. And the patterns in Jackson's research which were found to produce no effect upon symptom level (occupation rank higher than racial-ethnic rank and education rank higher than racial-ethnic rank) are exactly those which Lenski found to have the greatest impact upon political liberalism. Jackson summarizes,

> It would appear that these compared findings can best be explained by the assumption that all forms of status inconsistency are stressful for the individual, but that persons whose inconsistency is due to high racial-ethnic status and low occupational or educational status tend to respond to their stress physiologically, while persons of the opposite patterns of inconsistency respond politically.[1]

In keeping with Lenski's idea that there are several reactions or adaptations to status inconsistency, Jackson suggests that they should be studied simultaneously.

> Since different responses seem to be characteristic of different types of inconsistency, any study which measures only one possible response to inconsistency--such as the present study, as well as most of the previous research--<u>understates</u> the total impact of inconsistency upon the individual. "Adding" these studies together reveals a source of stress of some significance.[2]

---

[1] <u>Ibid</u>. p.476

[2] <u>Ibid</u>. p.479

David Schmitt

A recent study which supports Lenski's approach is one in which David Schmitt investigated status congruency and the desire for political change among married women. Liberalism was measured by the responses to a series of attitude statements dealing with debated areas for which government or private enterprise may assume primary responsibility. With status controlled, the respondent's average congruency was significantly related to liberalism-conservatism. Women with incongruent statuses tended to be more liberal than those whose statuses were congruent.

> In conclusion, it should be noted that while the results are consonant with previous findings, the magnitude of the relationships, like those of the previous studies, is not large despite the use of status scales derived from the respondent's estimation of standing. Thus, the findings evidence the ubiquity of the relationship between congruency and liberalism rather than the explanatory importance of status congruency in predicting behavior in more than one status position.[1]

Several studies will be reported now which fail to confirm the results of Lenski and the other investigators. It is interesting that Brandmeyer and Kenkel, who patterned their studies after Lenski's, came to opposite conclusions after analysis of their data.

---

[1] David R. Schmitt, "An Attitudinal Correlate of the Status Congruency of Married Women", Social Forces, 44:195, December 1965.

William Kenkel[1]

William Kenkel used some of the same hierarchies as Lenski and some different ones. He theorized that if status consistency is related to political attitudes then the relationship should be apparent when various status characteristics are employed. He asked questions regarding 1) Taft Hartley law (regulation of labour unions), 2) foreign trade, 3) government care for the needy, 4) strikes during wartime, 5)price control, 6) government ownership of aircraft factories, and 7) strictness of labour laws. Previous analysis of the data showed that there was a relationship between social status itself and the attitudes measured by these seven questions. Kenkel found that roughly the same proportion of the most status-consistent individuals responded to the attitude questions in a given direction as did the least status-consistent respondents. He says,

> The conclusion seems inescapable that, basically, respondents classified as consistent and inconsistent do not differ with regard to the attitudes measured by these seven questions.[2]

---

[1] William F. Kenkel, "The Relationship between Status Consistency and Politico-Economic Attitudes", American Sociological Review, 21:365-368, June 1956.

[2] Ibid. p.366.

Gerard Brandmeyer

Another close replication of the Lenski study was carried out by Gerard Brandmeyer.[1] He considered party preference and responses to a series of questions regarding jobs for the unemployed, old age insurance, doctor's care for everyone, opportunity to get a college education, a government guarantee of a minimum annual income, and government housing, as indicators of liberalism-conservatism.

He found little relationship between status consistency and political attitudes whether measured by party preference or any of the questions referred to above. He controlled his data for status level. In the high occupational status group those who preferred the Democratic party in the status inconsistent group were more numerous than those who preferred the Democratic party in the status consistent group. In the middle occupational status group the proportions preferring the Democratic party were almost the same. In the lower occupational status group the proportion preferring the Democratic party was greater among the consistent group than the inconsistent group--a relationship just the opposite to that found in the high

---

[1] Gerard Brandmeyer, "Status Consistency and Political Behavior: A Replication and Extension of Research", Sociological Quarterly, 6:241-256, Summer 1965.

status group. None of these differences reach statistical significance. Brandmeyer suggests an explanation as follows:

> At the higher levels of the three social status variables the fact that the inconsistents have sharply lower status on at least one of the other two variables seems to make them less conservative as a group than are those of consistently high status. On the other hand, at the lower levels of the three social status continua, the inconsistents have markedly higher status on at least one of the remaining two noncontrolled variables. The result is that they are less supportive of the liberal orientation than are the status consistents.[1]

After complete analysis of his data Brandmeyer concludes:

> Social status remains a far more powerful predictor of political party preference and political attitudes than is the nonvertical dimension of status consistency.[2]

K. Dennis Kelly and William J. Chambliss

Well after the plan of this thesis had been developed and much of the empirical work completed another article appeared in the American Sociological Review. Although it arrived too late to have any moulding effect on the design of this investigation, it is relevant to report its findings. Kelly and Chambliss[3] introduced several new

---

1 Ibid. p.252.

2 Loc. cit.

3 K. Dennis Kelly and William J. Chambliss, "Status Consistency and Political Attitudes", American Sociological Review, 31:375-382, June 1966.

aspects to the basic comparison between status consistency and political attitudes. They hypothesized that different results might be obtained if different aspects of liberalism were studies. Consequently they developed four scales dealing with four major counterparts of liberalism as defined by Lipset: 1) economic liberalism, 2) civil liberties, 3) civil rights, and 4) internationalism.

Their findings lead them to seriously question the usefulness of the concept of consistency in predicting political attitudes.

> The results of this study indicate that social class membership and ethnic background of respondent are far more important determinants of political attitudes than the degree to which persons are status consistent or inconsistent.[1]

The divergent findings of these seven empirical studies leave us uncertain about the relationship between status consistency and political attitudes, especially economic liberalism.

The conceptualization of inconsistency remains complex; many more factors interact than the number taken into account in these studies. It should not be surprising that a linear relationship was not discovered in the first efforts to study the relationship.

---

[1] Ibid. p.381.

Many empirical studies on the subject of status consistency have been reported in the literature that are not directly related to this research either because their theoretical formulations are different, or because they are relating consistency to some other behavior pattern, or because they are purely descriptive. They do form an important part of the literature and therefore will be referred to here.[1]

---

[1] Stuart Adams, "Status Congruency as a Variable in Small Group Performance", Social Forces, 32:16-22; 1953; M. Afsaruddin, "A Status Crystallization and Psychological Behavior", Journal of Pakistan Academy for Rural Development (Comilla) 3:249-270, April 1963; R.V. Exline and R.C. Ziller, "Status Congruency and Interpersonal Conflict in Decision Making Groups", Human Relations, 12:147-162, April, 1959; G.H. Fenchel, J.H. Monderer, and E.L. Hartley, "Subjective Status and the Equilibrium Hypothesis", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 46: 476-479, October 1951; Jack P. Gibbs and Walter T. Martin, Status Integration and Suicide, A Sociological Study, 225pp; R. Gold, "Janitors vs Tenants: A Status-Income Dilemma", American Journal of Sociology, 57: 486-493, March 1952; Elton F. Jackson and Peter J. Burke, "Status and Symptoms of Stress: Additive and Interaction Effects", American Sociological Review, 30: 556-564, August 1965; Gerhard Lenski, "Social Participation and Status Crystallization", American Sociological Review, 21:458-464, August 1956; Charles B. Nam and Mary G. Powers, "Variations in Socioeconomic Structure by Race, Residence, and the Life Cycle", American Sociological Review, 30:97-103, February 1965; Mary G. Powers, "Socio-economic Status and the Fertility of Married Women", Sociology and Social Research, 50:472-482; July 1966; Edward E. Sampson, "Status Congruence and Cognitive Consistency", Sociometry, 26:146-162, June 1963.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

LOCUS OF INCONSISTENCY

Most of the studies already described build on the premise than an individual finds a discrepancy in status ranks frustrating and stressful. This stress or frustration, whether or not it is recognized, causes the individual to react differently than an individual who does not experience this status discrepancy. Political attitudes may be one of the behaviors so affected. This formulation locates the inconsistency in the individual reactions. Robert E. Mitchell considers that the analysis of inconsistency would call for measurements based on information from two or more partners to a single social relationship. He points out that:

> Lenski and Jackson follow traditional procedures in indirectly indicating the orientations of others: they assume that each rank on a single dimension has its own distinctive constellation of orientations associated with it, and that once the rank is known, then the assumed reactions of others to the person with this rank is known also.[1]

This conceptualization of status consistency is at variance with the one worked out by George Caspar Homans.

---

[1] Robert Edward Mitchell, "Methodological Notes on a Theory of Status Crystallization", Public Opinion Quarterly, 28:317, Summer 1964.

He is concerned not only with the several ranks a single individual holds but also with the relative ranks of those held by the partners to a common social relationship:

> Status congruence is realized when all of the stimuli a man presents rank better or higher than the corresponding stimuli presented by another man--or when of course, all of the stimuli presented by the two men rank equal.[1]

Mitchell continues,

> Rather than construct an index to characterize an individual or group as consistent or inconsistent, he would have us characterize a 'social relationship.' Homan's theory differs from that of Lenski and Jackson in that the former is specifically directed to the characteristics of partners to a social relationship and to the tensions that arise between them, rather than only to tensions experienced by a single individual.[2]

Another investigator considered the important unit for the study of status consistency to be groups. Robert W. Hodge defines the initial premise of his paper as follows:

> That social groups and not individual actors are the appropriate unit of analysis in the study of social stratification. If one adopts the initial view point that occupational groups are significant categoric units of the social structure, then it becomes relevant to inquire about the status consistency of such collectivities.[3]

---

[1] George Caspar Homans, Social Behavior, p.248.

[2] Robert E. Mitchell, op. cit., p.317

[3] Robert W. Hodge, "Status Consistency of Occupational Groups", American Sociological Review, 27:337, June 1962.

Hodge measured the status consistency of occupational groups. Analyzing census data within occupational groups he correlated those with income of $3500 per annum or more with completion of four years of high school. The regression line indicated an estimated 61% of the variance in income is accounted for on the basis of education. The residuals of this regression may be interpreted as a measure of income independent of education. Hodge concludes:

> Owing to the functional relationship between education, occupation, and income, we have suggested that the residuals of the regression of income on education over occupational groups is a plausible indicator of occupational status consistency.[1]

These different conceptualizations of status consistency challenge the methods used by other sociologists. As the relationship of status inconsistency to political attitudes has not been specified, it is reasonable to examine and evaluate the various operational definitions with an eye to finding one that will be reliable. Fundamentally this is a problem of operational definition; when we make our measurement devices explicit we are better able to understand the meaning of the results. After his criticism of making individuals the locus of the measurement of inconsistency, Mitchell says in a footnote,

---

[1] Hodge, Ibid., p.343.

> A concern with single individuals is, of course, just as legitimate as a concern with social relations. However, the investigators should be clear about the distinction between the two.[1]

This seems to be implying that Mitchell felt that definitions could have been more precise in both Lenski's and Jackson's studies.

Another problem of definition is the relevance of awareness in the measurement of consistency. Can status inconsistency make a difference in a person's behavior even if he isn't aware of it? According to Kelly and Chambliss perceived inconsistency is not a better predictor of attitudes than actual inconsistency. In their conclusions they state:

> Whether one operationally defines status consistency by some objective criteria or in terms of respondent's perception, the results are essentially the same.[2]

PROBLEMS OF MEASUREMENT

Selection of Hierarchies

Which status hierarchies are the relevant ones when comparing status consistency with political attitudes? The literature has reached some consensus, if usage can determine a consensus. A glance down the list of seven relevent studies, Table 1, page 17, finds occupation

---

[1] Robert E. Mitchell, op. cit., p.318.

[2] K. Dennis Kelly and William J. Chambliss, "Status Consistency and Political Attitudes", American Sociological Review, 31:381, June 1966.

used in seven, education used in seven, income used in four, racial background used in three, prestige of dwelling area used in one, and rental value of dwelling used in one. The first four seem to be regarded as the most pertinent.

Goffman reports four criteria for the selection of status hierarchies in his study. They follow:

> Four criteria were used to guide the selection and weighting of status dimensions: (1) degree of probable consensus in the population on ordering ranks for the status consensus in the population on ordering ranks for the status dimensions, (2) likelihood that the dimension is used to mobilize expectations and demands regarding behavior and other characteristics, (3) the probability that they indicate inclusive restrictions of experiences such as social contacts, obligations, perquisites and so on, and (4) the availability of data for the present analysis.[1]

The above criteria make explicit the underlying rationale of Goffman and the other investigators in their choice of status hierarchies.

Kenkel departed from Lenski's selection of hierarchies by using prestige of dwelling area and rental value of dwelling as indicators. There is ample precedent for considering items of prestige centering on a person's dwelling. Notably, W. Lloyd Warner[2] included house type

---

[1] Irwin W. Goffman, "Status Consistency and Preference for Change in Power Distribution," American Sociological Review, 22:276-277, June 1957.

[2] W. Lloyd Warner, M. Meeker and Kenneth Eells, Social Class in America: A Manual for Procedure for the Measurement of Social Status, Chapters 8-14.

and residential location in the items of his Index of Status Characteristics (I. S. C.) by which he assigned social class position.

Lenski defended his own selection in his "Comment on Kenkel's Communication". He says,

> The four variables with which I worked were selected because they seemed to be the four most basic components of status in contemporary American life.[1]

In this research the status indicators to be used will be education, occupation and dwelling area prestige in one empirical study and education, occupation, and annual family income in the other empirical study. These were chosen largely because of availability and because they had been used by former investigators.

Assigning Status Rank to Women

The assigning of status rank to women characteristically poses a dilemma in studies of social stratification. The family is usually considered the basic unit of stratification in society and the status placement of the male head determines the placement of the other members of the family. Women are usually placed according to the status rank of their husband, or father, or the dominant male head of the household. Though this system is realistic for many families it cannot be expected to be correct in all cases.

---

[1] Gerhard E. Lenski, "Comment on Kenkel's Communication," American Sociological Review, 21:368, June 1956.

In studies of consistency women are usually assigned their husbands' rank in the occupation and income hierarchies. The education hierarchy usually is represented by her own achievement. The prestige of dwelling area is one hierarchy on which both man and wife can be suitably placed. Even in Schmitt's study of congruency of married women he assigned them ranks according to the status of their husbands for the occupation and income hierarchies. By using an all male sample, Brandmeyer avoided the complexities of placing women on the status hierarchies.

Until we have a more satisfactory way of assigning status rank to women in all studies of stratification this difficulty will remain with us in the study of inconsistency.

Proportions of Consistency and Inconsistency

The investigators present varying pictures of the prevalence of consistency in their samples. Table II, p.36, sets out the proportions in each consistency category in the relevant studies. The most extreme difference is between Lenski, who classified 28% of his sample as inconsistent, and Goffman, who classified 74% of his sample as inconsistent. Brandmeyer's study was designed to replicate Lenski's and he has roughly the same proportion as Lenski in each category. Kelly and Chambliss

were wanting to compare their findings with those of Lenski and Kenkel. Their categories make it possible to compare their findings with Kenkel's by comparing the high half and combining the middle and low quarters, and with Lenski's by combining the high half with the medium quarter to compare it to the low quarter.

Jackson divided consistency into three categories, the largest number falls in the moderately inconsistent group (56%) while the other two groups are of more nearly equal size (consistents 23% and sharply inconsistents 21%). This makes it possible to compare the extremes: the consistents and the sharply inconsistents.

These variations reflect a difference in mathematical manipulation rather than in the amount of status consistency in the population. Nam and Powers have studied distribution of socio-economic status and pattern of status consistency using 1960 U. S. Census data. In regard to the various measures they say of their own data,

> The socioeconomic measures used here were designed for comparative analysis and have limited absolute meaning. They may be most useful for comparing different areas or population subgroups, or for using socioeconomic status as a control in studying other relationships.[1]

This caution may be applicable to other studies.

---

[1] Charles B. Nam and Mary G. Powers, "Variations in Socioeconomic Structure by Race, Residence, and the Life Cycle", American Sociological Review, 30:98, February 1965.

Table II

PROPORTIONS FALLING IN EACH CONSISTENCY CATEGORY IN THE FORMER RELEVANT STUDIES

Authors	Categories	Number	Proportion
Lenski	High Crystallization (Consistent)	439	.72
	Low Crystallization (Inconsistent)	174	.28
		613	
Kenkel	Consistent	150	.50
	Inconsistent	150	.50
		300	
Goffman	Consistent	110	.26
	Inconsistent	315	.74
		425	
Jackson	Consistent	392	.23
	Moderately Inconsistent	931	.56
	Sharply Inconsistent	350	.21
		1673	
Brandmeyer	Status Consistent	499	.75
	Status Inconsistent	167	.25
		666	
Kelly and Chambliss	High Status Consistency	125	.51
	Medium " "	64	.26
	Low " "	57	.23
		246	

Note: Schmitt used a general congruency measure on the three dimensions but did not report frequencies. Emphasis was on paired characteristics.

Liberalism-Conservatism

Specification of the terms liberal and conservative are necessary especially as recent research indicates that individuals who are liberal on one issue may be conservative on others.

Lipset distinguished economic from non-economic liberalism-conservatism:

> Economic liberalism refers to the conventional issues concerning redistribution of income, status, and power among the classes.[1]

Non-economic liberalism-conservatism refers to issues such as civil liberties, civil rights, international foreign policy, and liberal immigration legislation.

It is interesting to note that without making this explicit Lenski and the authors of most of the other studies confined their indicators of liberalism to questions which fit well within Lipset's definition of economic liberalism.

Multivariate Analysis

Whether status rank or degree of status consistency is a better predictor of political attitudes is discussed by the various investigators. For example, Brandmeyer

---

[1] Seymour Martin Lipset, "Democracy and Working-Class Authoritarianism", American Sociological Review, 24: 485, August 1959.

says:

> Social status remains a far more powerful predictor of political party preference and political attitudes than is the nonvertical dimension of status consistency.[1]

Careful reading of Lenski's article reveals that he never made this claim for the consistency measure. In his conclusions he says:

> The conclusions which are drawn from a pilot study such as the present one should be concerned primarily with questions of the advisability of pursuing further the projected line of research, and the methods appropriate to further research, if such is warranted. Conclusions concerning the validity of given hypotheses about social relationships are hardly warranted, except insofar as they relate to the question of the advisability of further research.[2]

In this connection Schmitt's concluding paragraph is of interest:

> In conclusion, it should be noted that while the results are consonant with previous findings, the magnitude of the relationships, like those of the previous studies, is not large despite the use of status scales derived from the respondent's estimation of standing. Thus, the findings evidence the ubiquity of the relationship between congruency and liberalism rather than the explanatory importance of status congruency in predicting behavior in more than one status position.[3]

---

[1] Gerard Brandmeyer, "Status Consistency and Political Behavior: A Replication and Extension of Research," Sociological Quarterly, 6:252, Summer 1965.

[2] Gerhard E. Lenski, "Status Crystallization: A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status", American Sociological Review, 19:413, August 1954.

[3] David R. Schmitt, "An Attitudinal Correlate of the Status Congruency of Married Women", Social Forces, 44:195, December 1965.

In his "Methodological Notes", R.E. Mitchell[1] deplores the fact that the reader is denied certain crucial information. He suggested that both Lenski and Jackson should have presented a complete multivariate table in which ethnicity was controlled. He singled out ethnicity because the data did not make clear whether ethnic rank or low crystallization accounted for the most variation. Controlling by rank on the ethnic hierarchy would have clarified the importance of status position on the ethnic hierarchy in regard to preference for the Democratic party.

Lazarsfeld recommends multivariate analysis[2] as a tool for the study and interpretation of complex interrelations among a multiplicity of characteristics. Whenever an investigator finds himself faced with the relationship between two variables it is the procedure of multivariate analysis which enables him to consider the role of further variables. It is known that occupational prestige level is frequently related to political attitudes.

---

[1] R.E. Mitchell, op. cit., p.320-322.

[2] Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Morris Rosenberg, Editors, The Language of Social Research, A Reader in the Methodology of Social Research, p.111-112.

Therefore when comparing the degree of status consistency with political attitudes we control for occupation, or isolate the several occupational levels to see whether the relationship between status consistency and political attitudes varies in the same way within each of the occupational levels. When a third variable is thought to be related to the relationship of the two variables under investigation its effect can be determined by using it as a control in the manner described above.

Goffman[1] used multivariate analysis to analyze his data. He presented the results of the relation between status consistency and preference for change in power distribution as controlled by occupational status level. As a result of this control he found that the relationship between status consistency and preference for change in power distributions varies directly with stratum position.

Brandmeyer[2] also used multivariate analysis. He reported the relationship of status consistency and preference for the Democratic party as controlled for level of occupational rank. Large differences between the occupational status ranks were revealed. He also

---

[1] Goffman, op. cit., p.278-281.

[2] Brandmeyer, op. cit., p.250.

controlled for education and ethnic group but reported only that the results were very similar to those obtained when controlling for occupational status rank.

In former research on status consistency controlling by status rank level has revealed some new information about the relationship to political attitudes.

The method of multivariate analysis will be used in this research. The comparisons between consistency and political attitudes will be controlled for occupational status level, educational achievement level and either dwelling area prestige level or income level.

CHAPTER IV

THE EMPIRICAL STUDIES

Part A - INTRODUCTION

Secondary Analyses Undertaken

As all of the major published studies of status consistency have been carried out in the United States of America it was deemed useful to test some of these same concepts and methods in different national settings.

Two studies were chosen for secondary analysis: a study of voting behavior in Dunedin Central, the main city electorate in Dunedin, a city in New Zealand; and a study of voter's attitudes based on a national survey in Canada.

Canada and New Zealand both have enough general social characteristics in common with the United States and with each other to make the proposed replication suitable. All three would be considered modern, Western industrial nations with a similar political and cultural heritage.

In each case the choice of the particular study used was largely one of availability. Each had suitable background information on each individual to construct a consistency measure and information on voting or party preference and political attitudes which could be cast on the liberal-conservative continuum.

Decision to Use Objective Indicators

The choice of objective indicators to measure consistency is based on the concept that the effects of consistency and inconsistency can be real even though the individual may not be aware of it. For example a person may feel stress, or some other effect, in his social relations and not in any way attribute it to status inconsistency. This lack of awareness would be likely in a society which emphasizes equality and minimizes the effects of status factors.

Objective indicators refer to formal relationships and reflect general societal status ranking. Subjective factors, such as a feeling of deprivation, reflect a psychological effect on the individual and are more suitable for the study of inconsistency in a specific social relationship or small group.

For the Dunedin study, the indicators used in constructing the measure of status consistency are occupation, educational achievement, and prestige of dwelling area; in the Canadian study they are occupation, educational achievement and annual family income.

Jackson Method Chosen to Measure Status Consistency

The method selected for measuring status consistency in this research is the one used by Jackson in his article,

"Status Consistency and Symptoms of Stress".[1]

Status consistency refers to the similarity or difference of ranks of an individual measured by objective indicators in each of the relevant status hierarchies.

The procedure can be summarized as follows:

1. Divide each of the status dimensions into three ranks: 1. High status, 2. Middle status, 3. Low status.

2. Assign each respondent a rank on each dimension.

3. Divide the respondents into several categories according to the consistency of their status ranks. The categories are:

   a. Status consistent. Persons with the same rank on dimensions. (High, High, High or Middle, Middle, Middle).

   b. Moderately inconsistent. Persons with a deviation of only one rank step. (High, High, Middle or Low, Middle, Low, for example.)

   c. Sharply inconsistent. Persons with no like ranks, (High, Middle, Low, or Low, Middle, High, for example) and two rank deviates, (High, High, Low, or Low, High, Low, for example.

---

[1] Elton F. Jackson, "Status Consistency and Symptoms of Stress", American Sociological Review, 27:469-480, August 1962.

Hypotheses

The study centers around two major hypotheses. The sub-hypotheses are specified so that each may be tested separately.

H_0 There is no difference among the four status consistency groups in their support for the liberal party or parties and the conservative party or parties.

H_1 Inconsistent groups are more likely to support the liberal party or parties than the consistent group.

H_{1a} The moderately inconsistent group is more likely to support the liberal party or parties than is the consistent group.

H_{1b} The sharply inconsistent group of the No Like Rank type is more likely to support the liberal party or parties than is the consistent group.

H_{1c} The sharply inconsistent group of the Two Rank Deviate type is more likely to support the liberal party or parties than is the consistent group.

H_0 There is no difference among the four status consistency groups in their positions on a liberal-conservative scale or index.

H_1 Inconsistent groups are more likely to favour the liberal positions on the liberal-conservative scale or index than is the consistent group.

H_{1a} The moderately inconsistent group is more likely to favour the liberal positions than is the consistent group.

H_{1b} The sharply inconsistent group of the No Like Rank type is more likely to favour the liberal positions than is the consistent group.

H_{1c} The sharply inconsistent group of the Two Rank Deviate type is more likely to favour the liberal positions than is the consistent group.

Tests of Significance

The tests of significance used in this research to test the above hypotheses are Chi Square and Mann Whitney U.[1]

Chi square is used when measurement of data is either ordinal or nominal and requires that the frequencies be in discrete categories. It tests whether a significant difference exists between an observed number of responses falling in each category and an expected number of responses based on the null hypothesis. Chi square is used in this research to assess the differences between consistency groups on the number of supporters of the liberal party (or parties) and of the conservative party (or parties).

The Mann Whitney U test requires that ordinal measurement be achieved. It tests whether the "bulk" of one group is higher on the measuring scale than the bulk of the other group. In this research the Mann Whitney U test is used to test the significance of differences between consistency groups on their placement on the liberal-conservative scale or the government involvement index.

---

[1] Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences.

The significance level selected is .05. When results of significance tests are at the .10 level, they will be reported as approaching significance.

PART B - DUNEDIN CENTRAL

The New Zealand study selected for secondary analysis is one carried out by Austin Mitchell in Dunedin immediately following the general election of 1960.[1] He studied the main electorate of the centre of the city, suitably called Dunedin Central.[2] His full report of many aspects of that election is available in his article. Of special interest here is the section, "Who Votes How", in which he seeks to discover the social bases of political attitudes within this electorate.

Sample

From the electoral roll a random sample of 594 individuals was taken of which 551 were interviewed successfully. The interviews were completed within a fortnight after the election.

---

[1] The city of Dunedin is on the South Island of New Zealand. The population in 1961 was 105,003 according to the New Zealand Official Yearbook, 1965.

[2] Austin Mitchell, "Dunedin Central", Political Science, 14:27-80, March 1962. The author is indebted to Dr. Austin Mitchell for making available the original data cards and granting permission for the secondary analysis.

Measuring Status Consistency

The three attributes selected for the hierarchies to be considered in measuring status consistency are occupational status, educational achievement, and dwelling area prestige. Following is a description of the three hierarchies and the criteria used to place each individual in the proper rank.

Educational Hierarchy

The educational hierarchy in New Zealand must take account of the changes in the educational system in the 20th Century. The crucial changes for this study took place in 1934, the year in which School Certificate was introduced, and in 1944, the year in which the school leaving age was raised to 15 years.

As the data in this study were gathered in 1960 this means that a respondent in this investigation who was forty-one years old (born in 1919) and left school at fifteen years of age would be the oldest person who had the opportunity to achieve School Certificate. Likewise a respondent thirty-one years old (born in 1929) is the oldest person who was required by law to stay at school until his fifteenth birthday. With these considerations in mind the following system of ranks was developed.[1]

---

[1] One case was dropped from the analysis because it did not have educational information. Resultant number is 550.

Rank I Number: 151 — Includes all respondents with a University Degree, those who attained University Entrance or School Certificate at secondary school and those respondents who remained at school until seventeen years or older if they were born in 1919 or before.

Rank II Number: 208 — Includes respondents who left secondary school without the qualification of School Certificate or University Entrance at age fifteen, or at age sixteen, and those who left secondary school without the qualification of School Certificate or University Entrance at age seventeen or older who were born in 1920 or later.

Rank III Number: 191 — Includes all respondents who left secondary school without the qualification of University Entrance or School Certificate before age 15.

Occupational Hierarchy

The Congalton-Havighurst scale for occupational status ranking in New Zealand was used to place respondents in the appropriate occupational rank.[1] Married women were ranked according to their husband's occupation.

The occupational ranks are as follows:

Rank I Number: 134 — Rank I is made up of those in the three highest ranks on the Congalton Havighurst scale. They represent all of the upper and middle professionals such as doctors, professional engineers, clergymen and secondary school teachers, the owners, company directors and managers of large businesses, the well established farmers, the upper administrative office workers such as a departmental head in the government service and accountants. No manual workers, skilled or unskilled are in this group.

---

[1] A.A. Congalton and R.J. Havighurst, "Status Ranking of Occupations in New Zealand", Australian Journal of Psychology, 6:10-16, June 1954.

Rank II Number: 213 — Rank II is made up of those in groups four and five on the Congalton Havighurst scale. They include the lower professionals such as social workers and primary school teachers, owners of small businesses, farm managers and farm tenants, the large bulk of office and sales workers such as real estate agents, insurance agents, bank clerks, stenographers and typists, salesmen, uniformed workers such as policemen and firemen, industrial foremen, skilled tradesmen such as electricians, plumbers, and motor mechanics.

Rank III Number: 203 — Rank III is made up of the lower two groups on the Congalton Havighurst scale. These respondents are farm labourers, established or migratory, shop assistents and sales persons, the lower skilled manual workers such as fitters, painters, butchers, bar managers, bricklayers, all of the semiskilled workers such as machinists, taxi and bus drivers, railway conductors and shunters, packers and all the unskilled repetitive workers such as factory operatives, milk deliverymen, and labourers.

Dwelling Area Hierarchy

The electorate Dunedin Central includes the city center, some of the city's best residential suburbs and a small area of farming land on the city boundary. Mitchell describes distinct areas within the electorate and they are used to make up the dwelling area ranks below.

The dwelling area ranks are as follows:

Rank I Number: 172 — The Crest. This is the area at the top of the ridge which is predominantly the "good" residential area.

Rank II Number: 277 — The Rise and Over. This is the lower part of the city rise together with Mornington and the area beyond the crest which is characterized by newer, modest residences and the more rural area. A small proportion of people living in institutions on the flat, as the nurses home and the large hotels, were re-allocated to the socially intermediate area.

Rank III Number: 101 — The Flat. This is now mostly a commercial and industrial area but still includes some low cost and low class housing.

Each respondent was assigned a rank on each of the three hierarchies according to the information given to the interviewer. According to the pattern of the ranks each respondent was assigned to a consistency type.

Four consistency types were used:

1. Consistent A person who had the same rank on all three hierarchies was placed in this category. For example, a bank manager who had one year at university and lived on the Crest: or a butcher, who left school before he was 15 years of age who lived on the Flat.

2. Moderately Inconsistent A person who had only one rank higher or lower than the other two ranks was placed in this category. For example, the wife of a clergyman who achieved School Certificate and lived in Mornington; or a painter who left school at age 16 years without School Certificate or University Entrance who lives on the Flat.

3. Sharply Inconsistent, No Like Rank Type

A person who was assigned a different rank on each of three hierarchies was placed in this category. For example, a taxi driver who had achieved School Certificate who lived in the semirural area beyond the Crest, or the wife of an accountant who left school before age 15 years who lives on the lower part of the city rise.

4. Sharply Inconsistent, Two Rank Deviate Type

A person whose ranks are all either high or low (two of one and one of the other) was placed in this category. For example, a shop assistant who had achieved School Certificate and who lived on the flat, or the manager of a large business who left school before he was 15 years old who lives on the crest.

The distribution of the consistency categories is as follows:

Dunedin Study	Number	Percentage
Consistents	134	24%
Moderately Inconsistents	327	60%
Sharply Inconsistents	89	16%
Total	550	

Comparing this distribution in Dunedin Central with those of other investigators (Table II, page 36) we observe that it is most similar to Jackson's distribution and also comparable to Goffman's dichotomous distribution which placed all the inconsistents in a single category.

Measuring Political Attitudes

Voting behavior and an attitude scale were the two indicators used to measure political liberalism. The interviews for this study were completed within a fortnight of the 1960 general election giving each respondent little opportunity to forget which party he supported or his views on the election issues.

Vote and Party Preference

The Labour party and the National party are the two major political parties in New Zealand. In the sample,

244 respondents reported having voted for the Labour party and 236 reported having voted for the National party. Thirty-three respondents reported voting for the Social Credit party, twelve for the Independent party, and twenty-six reported that they did not vote. For purposes of analysis the party preferences of those who did not vote were combined with those who reported voting.

Those who voted for or preferred the Labour party are classified as liberal and those who voted for or preferred the National party are classified as conservative. The other parties, Social Credit and Independent, do not fit into the liberal-conservative continuum and as their supporters were few they were dropped from the analysis.

Policy Attitudes

In his study Mitchell asked the respondents' opinion on eight policy statements which were of interest at the time of the election. The following four were considered to be related to liberalism or conservatism and might represent the respondents' political attitudes.

1. Membership in trade unions should be made voluntary.
2. There should be more scope for private enterprise.
3. Price control should be used where necessary.
4. Television should be controlled by the state.

Respondents were asked to indicate agreement or disagreement with policy statements. From this information a Likert type item analysis was done to see if the four

items would form a scale. The item analysis was done on the basis of a 20% sample, 110 cases, or every 5th card with a random start.

To weight the responses, a score of one was assigned to the "liberal" response, a score of two to "no opinion" and a score of three to the "conservative" response, as follows:

	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree
1. Membership in trade unions should be made voluntary.	3	2	1
2. There should be more scope for private enterprise.	3	2	1
3. Price control should be used where necessary.	1	2	3
4. Television should be controlled by the state.	1	2	3

The total score for these four items was computed for each individual and then the high scorers and low scorers were compared to discover the discriminatory qualities of each item. On first tabulation, the item on price control was dropped. It did not make a discrimination as almost everyone favoured using price control where necessary. The scores for the remaining three items were tabulated and the item on private enterprise had to be dropped as the difference between the medians of the high scorers and the low scorers was less than .5.

The remaining two items, on trade union membership and state control of television proved to make good discriminations. The difference between the medians of

the high scorers and the low scorers on the trade union statement was 1.91 and on the television statement was 1.63. Therefore these two items were kept as a scale, and a scale score was then assigned to each individual.

A score of six represents the most conservative position. A score of five represents one conservative response and one no opinion; thus it leans in the direction of conservatism. A score of four can be either two no opinion responses, or one conservative and one liberal answer. Due to its ambiguity this category was dropped from the analysis. A score of three indicates one liberal response plus a no opinion, thus leaning in the direction of liberalism. A score of two represents two liberal responses, the most liberal position.

Scale scores and vote were compared. The Labour party supporters favoured the more liberal positions and the National party supporters favoured the more conservative positions. This difference was found significant beyond the .00003 level by the Mann Whitney U test (z=9.73).

It is not difficult to make a case for these statements representing attitudes on the liberal-conservative continuum by face validity. Issues dealing with labour unions are part of the established area of disagreement between liberals and conservatives. State control of natural resources, as television channels might be

considered in this case, is also a central area of dispute. In their studies of status consistency and liberal political attitudes, both Kenkel and Schmitt used statements about the strictness of labour laws and the power of labour unions to represent the liberal-conservative dimension.[1]

Analysis

Status Consistency and Vote

In comparing the degree of status consistency with vote no clear pattern emerges. The frequencies are set out in Table III below. When the consistent group is compared with the moderately inconsistent group $x^2=.50$, and $p<.25>.15$. When the consistent group is compared with the no like rank group of the sharply inconsistents $x^2=1.27$, and $p<.15>.10$. In each case there is a one degree of freedom and a one tail test of significance is used as the hypothesis is directional. Though not statistically significant these frequencies are in the predicted direction. In the last comparison, consistents

---

[1] William F. Kenkel, "The Relationship between Status Consistency and Politico-Economic Attitudes", American Sociological Review, 21:366, June 1956; and David R. Schmitt, "An Attitudinal Correlate of the Status Congruency of Married Women", Social Forces, 44:193, December 1965.

and two rank deviate group, the frequency distribution is opposite to the hypothesis, thus no test of significance is required.

Table III

PERCENT VOTING FOR EACH PARTY by CONSISTENCY TYPE

Political Party	Consistent	Moderately Inconsistent	Sharply Inconsistent	
			No Like Rank	Two Rank Deviate
Labour	47.1% N=57	51.5% N=154	58.0% N=29	41.9% N=13
National	52.9% N=64	48.5% N=145	42.0% N=21	58.1% N=18
Total	121 100%	299 100%	50 100%	31 100%

It is a well established finding of political sociology that each of the three dimensions used to compute the status consistency score is related to political attitudes and vote. In view of this, the data presented in Table III will be controlled by occupation, education, and dwelling area in turn.

When the data is controlled for occupation it is recast so that it shows the relationship between status consistency and vote for each occupational level, as shown in Table IV.

In the high occupational status group all the relationships are in the predicted direction. The moderately

Table IV

PERCENTAGE OF LABOUR VOTE BY CONSISTENCY FOR EACH OCCUPATION LEVEL (DUNEDIN CENTRAL)

Occupation Group	Consistent	Moderately Inconsistent	Sharply Inconsistent[1]
High	12.2% N=41	19.0% N=58 X^2=.38, p<.35>.25[2]	45% N=22 X^2=5.26, p<.025>.01
Middle	50% N=42	40.6% N=128	40.9% N=22
Low	81.6% N=38	80.5% N=113	64.8% N=37

1 When the two sharply inconsistent groups are in the same directional relationship to the consistent and moderately inconsistent groups, they are combined.

2 Each X^2 refers to a comparison with the consistent group. With each X^2 there is one degree of freedom. A one tail test of significance is used as each hypothesis is directional.

inconsistent and the sharply inconsistent groups have a higher percentage voting for the Labour party. Differences between the consistent group and the moderately inconsistent group are not statistically significant. (X^2=.38, p<.35>.25). Difference between the consistent and sharply inconsistent groups is very significant. (X^2=5.26, p<.025>.01). In the middle occupational status group and the low occupational status group the relationships are in a direction opposite to that of the hypothesis.

When educational achievement is used as a control a slightly different pattern appears. The percentage of Labour vote is larger among all the inconsistent groups in the high and middle educational levels. Table XI, setting out the percentages and frequencies, is in the Appendix. In the high educational group the relationship between the consistent and moderately inconsistent groups approaches significance (X^2=2.00 with one degree of freedom p<.10>.05) while the relationship between the consistent and sharply inconsistent groups is very significant (X^2=8.16 with one degree of freedom p<.005). In the middle educational group the difference between the consistent and moderately inconsistent groups is not statistically significant and the difference between the consistent and sharply inconsistent groups approaches significance (X^2=2.52 with one degree of freedom p<.10

$>.05$). In the lower educational achievement group the frequencies are not in the predicted direction.

When the data are controlled for dwelling area the pattern is similar to the one found when controlling for education. Table XII showing frequencies and percentages voting Labour is in the Appendix. The tests of significance can be summarized as follows: in the high prestige area the difference between consistent and moderately inconsistent groups is not significant (X^2=1.36 with one degree of freedom, $p < .15 > .10$). Between the consistent group and the sharply inconsistent groups the difference is very significant (X^2=14.16 with one degree of freedom, $p < .0005$). In the middle prestige area the frequencies continue in the predicted direction but the differences are not statistically significant. In the low prestige area the frequencies are not in the predicted direction.

Summary

In spite of the fact that there are few significant relationships, those found do show a pattern. In each high group (high occupation, high education, and high dwelling area) there is a significant difference in the predicted direction between consistent persons and sharply inconsistent persons. The sharply inconsistent persons are more likely to vote for the Labour party

than individuals in the consistent group. Conversely in the low groups, the sharply inconsistent persons are more likely to vote for the National party than are the consistent individuals.

Liberal-Conservative Scale and Status Consistency

A second indicator of political attitudes is a scale based on the respondents' agreement or disagreement with two policy statements. These statements dealt with voluntary membership in trade unions and state control of television, two issues closely related to economic liberalism. In the analysis of the scale scores we consider four positions: most liberal (score 2), slightly liberal (score 3), slightly conservative (score 5), and most conservative (score 6). The Mann Whitney U test will be used to test the statistical significance of the differences in scale scores between the consistency groups.

Table V sets out the overall comparisons. All frequencies are in the predicted direction--the moderately and sharply inconsistent groups are more likely to have lower scores on the scale and thus be more liberal. Significance was tested by the Mann Whitney U test. The relationship between consistent and moderately inconsistent groups is significant ($z=2.25$, $p=.0122$) and the relationship between consistent and sharply inconsistent of no like rank approaches significance ($z=1.40$, $p=.0808$).

Table V

LIBERAL-CONSERVATIVE SCORE BY STATUS CONSISTENCY
Percent in each Scale Position (Dunedin Central)

Scale Score	Consistent	Moderately Inconsistent	Sharply Inconsistent No Like Rank	Sharply Inconsistent Two Rank Deviate
2	21.5% (17)	33.3% (66)	38.7% (12)	30.4% (7)
3	15.2% (12)	11.6% (23)	12.9% (4)	8.7% (2)
5	10.1% (8)	19.2% (38)	6.5% (2)	26.1% (6)
6	53.2% (42)	35.9% (71)	41.9% (13)	34.8% (8)
TOTAL	100% (79)	100% (198)	100% (31)	100% (23)

The number of cases in each category is in parentheses.
Score 2 is most liberal, score 6 most conservative.
Score 4 was dropped as it represented ambiguity or no opinion.

Results of the Mann Whitney U Tests:

Comparing:
Consistent and Moderately Inconsistent $z=2.25$, $p=.0122$
Consistent and No Like Rank $z=1.40$, $p=.0808$
Consistent and Two Rank Deviate $z=1.13$, $p=.1292$

The difference between consistents and sharply inconsistents of two rank deviate did not reach significance ($z=1.13$, $p=.1292$).

In comparing status consistency with the liberalism-conservative scale the data were controlled by occupation, education, and dwelling area in turn.

When controlled for occupational level all the frequencies are in the direction of the hypothesis except for one in the middle occupation group.

In the high occupation group none of the differences are statistically significant. (Comparing consistents and moderately inconsistent groups, $z=.644$, $p=.2611$; comparing consistent and no like rank groups, $z=.24$, $p=.4052$; and comparing consistents and two rank deviates, $z=.35$, $p=.3632$).

In the middle occupation group the difference between consistents and moderately inconsistents was not in the predicted direction and the difference between consistents and no like rank groups was not significant ($z=.54$, $p=.2946$).

It is in the low occupation group that one significant difference was found--between consistent and moderately inconsistent groups ($z=1.88$, $p=.0301$). The other two comparisons in the group were not significant.

Table VI

LIBERAL-CONSERVATIVE SCORE BY STATUS CONSISTENCY FOR EACH OCCUPATION LEVEL (Dunedin Central)

Scale Score	Consistent	Moderately Inconsistent	Sharply Inconsistent No Like Rank	Sharply Inconsistent Two Rank Deviate
High Occupation Group				
2	13.3% (4)	18.0% (7)	0% (0)	22.2% (2)
3	10.0% (3)	0% (0)	25.0% (1)	0% (0)
5	13.3% (4)	30.7% (12)	25.0% (1)	22.2% (2)
6	63.4% (19)	51.3% (20)	50.0% (2)	55.6% (5)
TOTAL	100% (30)	100% (39)	100% (4)	100% (9)
Middle Occupation Group				
2	24.2% (7)	23.7% (18)	37.5% (6)	
3	20.7% (6)	10.5% (8)	12.5% (2)	
5	6.9% (2)	22.4% (17)	6.2% (1)	
6	48.2% (14)	43.4% (33)	43.8% (7)	
TOTAL	100% (29)	100% (76)	100% (16)	
Low Occupation Group				
2	30.0% (6)	49.4% (41)	54.5% (6)	35.7% (5)
3	15.0% (3)	18.1% (15)	9.2% (1)	14.3% (2)
5	10.0% (2)	10.8% (9)	0% (0)	28.6% (4)
6	45.0% (9)	21.7% (18)	36.3% (4)	21.4% (3)
TOTAL	100% (20)	100% (83)	100% (11)	100% (14)

The number of cases in each category is in parentheses. Score 2 is most liberal, score 6 most conservative. Score 4 was dropped as it represented ambiguity or no opinion.

Results of Mann Whitney U Tests

Comparing:	High Occupation	Middle Occupation	Low Occupation
Consistent with Moderately Inconsistent	z=.644 p=.2611	Opposite Direction	z=1.88 p=.0301
Consistent with No Like Rank	z=.24 p=.4052	z=.54 p=.2946	U=132.5 p > .05
Consistent with Two Rank Deviate	z=.35 p=.3632		U=163.5 p > .05

When controlled by education level only one difference reaches a magnitude that is statistically significant. It is in the high education group, between the consistents and sharply inconsistent of no like rank ($z=1.82$, $p=.0344$). The other differences in the high education group were not significant. (Comparing consistent and moderately inconsistent groups $z=.68$, $p=.2483$, and comparing consistents and two rank deviates $z=.85$, $p=.1977$). See Table XIII in the Appendix for the percentages and frequencies in each category, and results of the tests of significance.

In the middle education group the difference between the consistent and moderately inconsistent groups was not significant ($z=1.18$, $p=.1190$), nor was the difference between consistents and no like rank groups ($z=.985$, $p=.1611$).

In the low education group the difference between consistents and moderately inconsistents was not significant, ($z=1.23$, $p=.1093$). Comparing the consistent and no like rank groups the frequencies are not in the predicted direction, and comparing consistent and two rank deviate groups the differences are not significant at the .05 level.

When the data are controlled by type of area we find two comparisons reach statistical significance. In the high status area, the differences between the consistents

and the two sharply inconsistent groups are statistically significant (comparing consistent with no like rank, $z=1.64$, $p=.0505$, and comparing consistent with two rank deviate groups $z=2.15$, $p=.0158$). The difference between the consistent group and the moderately inconsistent group is not statistically significant.

In the middle prestige area and in the low prestige area the relationships are either not significant or not in the predicted direction. Table XIV in the Appendix gives the frequencies, percentages and results of the tests of significance.

Summary

Significant differences were few when comparing consistency groups with scores on the liberal-conservative scale. However most of the comparisons are in the predicted direction.

The grouping of several significant relationships in the high education and high dwelling area groups is in keeping with the results found when vote was compared to status consistency. When the datawere controlled by occupation there were no significant relationships in the high group and one between the consistents and moderately inconsistents in the low group. This is opposite to the findings when vote was compared with consistency.

Conclusions

Let us review the findings of this analysis in the light of the hypotheses. (Hypotheses are on page 45). In the first set of hypotheses regarding vote the null hypothesis says there is no difference among the four status consistency groups in their support for the liberal party and the conservative party.

In general the results support the null hypothesis. At least it is necessary to specify under what circumstances an association was found. When controlled for status level, it is only in the high status groups, that the relationship exists as predicted, the sharply inconsistent groups were more likely to vote for the liberal party.

The second set of hypotheses refer to score on a liberalism-conservatism scale. It is predicted that the more inconsistent groups are more likely to hold the liberal positions on the scale.

The significant findings are almost randomly distributed and it is difficult to determine what meaning they might have. When degree of status consistency was compared to scale score without controls we found a significant difference between the consistents and the moderately inconsistents. This difference disappeared when controls for status level were applied, except in

the low occupational group where the difference between consistents and moderately inconsistents was found to be statistically significant.

The other significant findings were in the high educational group where the difference between consistents and sharply inconsistents of the no like rank type were statistically significant, and in the high prestige dwelling area group the differences between the consistent group and both types of inconsistent groups were found to be statistically significant.

These limited significant results lend support to the null hypothesis. Some possible explanations for these results will be discussed in the final chapter.

PART C - CANADIAN SURVEY

This secondary analysis was carried out with the results of a nation wide survey of Canada. The findings are fully reported in a book by John Paul and Jerome Laulicht, In Your Opinion.[1]

---

[1] John Paul and Jerome Laulicht, In Your Opinion.
The author is grateful to Dr. Jerome Laulicht for granting permission for this secondary analysis and sending the data deck and code sheets from the original study.

Sample

The information in this national survey was taken from personal interviews completed during the first two weeks of November 1962. It is of interest to recall that this was immediately after the resolution of the Cuban crisis. Regarding the sample the authors report:

> The population from which the national sample was drawn consisted of Canadian citizens and British subjects residing in Canada who were 21 years of age or over. Area sampling was used to cover towns and cities with a population of over 1000. Seventy-two quota points were used to cover the rural population. The northern half of Newfoundland, the Northwest territories, and similarly difficult to reach areas were excluded from the sample.[1]

The survey was sponsored by the Canadian Peace Research Institute and the interviews were carried out on its behalf by Canadian Facts, one of the largest and oldest Canadian survey organizations.

Measuring Status Consistency

Occupation of the household head, educational achievement of the respondent, and annual family income are the three status attributes used to measure status consistency in this analysis. Data were received on punched IBM cards with the categories within these status attributes already established and coded. This constituted a limitation on the way each status hierarchy could be divided into three ranks.

---

[1] Ibid. p.4.

Occupational Hierarchy

The occupation of the head of the household was ranked according to the North-Hatt scale[1] for occupational prestige. The divisions made follow:

Rank I (N=184) Includes occupations such as manager of new car sales, civil engineer, criminal lawyer, and medical doctor.

Rank II (N=371) Includes occupations such as secretary and librarian.

Rank III (N=445) Includes such occupations as garbage collector, bartender, elevator attendant, gas station attendant, semi-skilled factory machine worker, and cashier.

Educational Hierarchy

Included in the educational ranking were attendance at Public School (grades 1-8), High School (grades 9-13), Technical School, and University. The details of the ranks follow:

Rank I (N=126) Includes respondents who attended university or graduated from university.

Rank II (N=508) Includes respondents who attended high school or technical school and those who graduated from high school or technical school. The one percent who refused to answer the education question was placed in this modal group.

Rank III (N=366) Included respondents who graduated from public school, attended public school, or who had no formal schooling.

---

[1] Albert J. Reiss, Jr., Occupations and Social Status, p.54-57.

Income Hierarchy

Rank I (N=173) Includes families with incomes above $7000 per year.

Rank II (N=440) Includes families with incomes between $4000 and $6999 per year.

Rank III (N=387) Includes families with incomes of less than $3999 per year.

The above frequencies include a group of 15% who refused to answer the question on income. These have been distributed randomly in the three categories and in proportion to the frequency in each category. This procedure decreases the precision of the assignment of rank on the income hierarchy but allows us to keep all cases in the analysis.

Each respondent was assigned to one of the four consistency types on the basis of the rankings just described. The number of cases in each of the consistency groups is as follows:

Canadian Survey	Number	Percentage
Consistents	293	29.3%
Moderately Inconsistents	562	56.2%
Sharply Inconsistent (No Like Rank 85, and Two Rank Deviate 60)	145	14.5%
	1000	

The proportions in each group are similar to the ones found in the Dunedin Central analysis.

Measuring Political Attitudes

Two indicators will be used to measure political attitudes, party preference and an index of political attitudes.

Party preference was determined by answers to the question, "If a federal election was called tomorrow, which party would you vote for?". The major parties chosen were the Progressive Conservative party, the Liberal party, the Social Credit party, and the New Democratic party.

Regionalism and religious loyalties are more important in Canadian political life than in the United States or in New Zealand. Of this characteristic R.R. Alford says,

> The discovery that class voting is relatively low does not imply that class interests do not exist in Canadian society. Class cleavages do exist in Canada and are expressed in political demands and through national parties, but they do not result in sharply divergent support by social classes for the major national parties.[1]

Alford places the major parties on a Left-Right continuum as follows: the New Democratic party and the Liberal party are on the left or liberal end and the Progressive Conservative party and the Social Credit party are on the right or conservative end of the continuum.[2] In the analysis to follow the two liberal

---

[1] R.R. Alford, Party and Society, The Anglo American Democracies, p.250.

[2] Ibid. p.13.

parties are combined and treated as one as are the two conservative parties.

Since the publication of In Your Opinion, Dr. Jerome Laulicht has developed indices and scales from the survey results. Of interest in this analysis is the government involvement index.

This includes responses reflecting attitudes toward the participation of the federal government in economic affairs. The specific attitude questions are:[1]

Question: Would you approve of a government sponsored health plan to pay the family's doctor bills?

__Approve, __Disapprove, __DK.

Question: If general disarmament could be carried out, it would cut our defense budget considerably. What do you think we should do with the money saved?

a. Cut taxes.
b. Give more money to the U.N. to strengthen it.
c. Spend it for health research and services.
d. Spend it on education.
e. Spend it for economic assistance to underdeveloped nations.
f. Spend it on public works.
g. Other.

Only responses a, c, and f were considered in the index.

Question: If a federal election was called tomorrow, which party would you vote for? Progressive Conservative,

---

[1] The questions in the above order were originally numbered 1, 33a, 33c, 20cI in thequestionnaire. These and the other questions of the survey can be found in the book, In Your Opinion, beginning on page 112.

Liberal, Social Credit, New Democratic, Undecided, Refused, Other.

A high score on this index indicates that the respondent favours government involvement.

Analysis

Consistency and Party Preference

Although similar methods of measuring status consistency and political attitudes were used in both the study in New Zealand and the one in Canada the results are drastically different.

Table VII

PERCENT VOTING FOR LIBERAL PARTIES AND CONSERVATIVE PARTIES by CONSISTENCY TYPE (CANADA)

Party Preference	Degree of Status Consistency			
	Consistents	Moderately Inconsistent	Sharply Inconsistent	
			No Like Rank	Two Rank Deviate
Liberal Parties	46% N=81	57.5% N=208	42% N=21	47.5% N=18
Conservative Parties	54% N=95	42.5% N=155	58% N=29	52.5% N=20
TOTAL	100% N=176	100% N=363	100% N=50	100% N=38

The results of the first comparison of status consistency and party preference is presented in Table VII above. When consistents and moderately inconsistents are compared $X^2=5.61$ with one degree of freedom, $p<.01$, indicating that we can assert with confidence that the

moderate inconsistents are more likely to favour the more liberal parties. When consistents and inconsistents of the no like rank type are compared we find the opposite result. A larger percentage of consistents indicated a preference for the liberal parties than the inconsistents. This difference, however, is not very great. Then the relationship reverses again. When the consistents are compared to the inconsistents of the two rank deviate type, a larger percentage of inconsistents expressed preference for the liberal parties than the consistents. Although in the predicted direction, this difference was small and not statistically significant.

The observation made in this original comparison, that the significant difference lies between the consistents and the moderately inconsistents, continues when controls for status level are applied. The data were controlled for occupational level, educational achievement level, and income level.

Table VIII gives the percentage of preference for the liberal parties by consistency for each occupation level. In the high occupation group, all frequencies are opposite to the hypothsized relationship. The consistents (those in high status occupations who rank high on the education and income hierarchies as well) have a greater percentage favouring the liberal parties than any of the inconsistent

groups. The difference is small between the consistent and moderately inconsistent groups but large between the consistent and each of the sharply inconsistent groups.

Table VIII

PERCENTAGE OF PREFERENCE FOR THE LIBERAL PARTIES BY CONSISTENCY FOR EACH OCCUPATION LEVEL (CANADA)

Occupation Group	Consistent	Moderately Inconsistent	Sharply Inconsistent	
			No Like Rank	Two Rank Deviate
High	66% N=18	62% N=48	40% N=25	48% N=23
Middle	57% N=77	60% N=152 X^2=.064, p=.40[1]	37% N=8	not possible
Low	31% N=81	53% N=163 X^2=10.15, p <.005	47% N=17 X^2=1.00, p <.25 >.15	47% N=15 X^2=.80, p <.25 >.15

[1] Each X^2 refers to a comparison with the consistent group. With each X^2 there is one degree of freedom. A one tail test of significance is used as each hypothesis is directional.

In the middle occupation group the relationship between consistent and moderately inconsistent groups is in the predicted direction but is not significant (X^2=.064, with one degree of freedom, p=.40) while the other relationship, that between consistent and sharply inconsistent group, is not in the predicted direction.

In the low occupation level (that is the unskilled workers) all the inconsistent groups have higher percentages favouring the liberal parties than the consistent group. The difference between the consistent group and the moderately inconsistent group is statistically significant (X^2=10.15, with one degree of freedom, $p < .005$), while the other comparisons do not reach significance.

When the data are controlled for educational achievement a similar pattern is found. In the high education group (those who attended university or graduated from university) none of the frequencies support the hypotheses. In the middle education group (those who attended or graduated from high school or technical school) the consistents and moderately inconsistents have the same percentage favouring the liberal parties. In the comparison between consistents and sharply inconsistents of no like rank, the percentage prefering the liberal parties is greater for the consistents.

In the low education group (those who completed eight grades or less) there is a significant difference between the consistents and the moderately inconsistents (X^2=11.89, with one degree of freedom, $p < .0005$). Comparing the consistent group with the no like rank group X^2=.05, with one degree of freedom, $p < .45 > .40$.

The two rank deviate group has smaller percentage prefering the liberal parties than the consistent group, thus the relationship is not in the predicted direction. Table XV in the Appendix sets out the percentages and number of cases in each category.

Table XVI in the Appendix gives the percentage of preference for the liberal parties by consistency for each income level. For the high income group (those with annual family income of $7000 or more) all the frequencies are opposite to that predicted. For the middle income group (those with annual family income from $4000 to $6999) one of the comparisons only is in the predicted direction. Comparing the consistents and moderately inconsistents X^2=.42, with one degree of freedom, $p < .35 > .25$. In the low income group, (those with annual family incomes under $3999) the differences are all in the predicted direction with two of them reaching statistical significance. Comparing consistent and moderately inconsistent groups X^2=6.71, with one degree of freedom, $p < .005$. Comparing consistent and no like rank groups X^2=.33, with one degree of freedom, $p < .35 > .25$. Comparing consistent and two rank deviate groups X^2=3.55, with one degree of freedom, $p < .05$.

Summary

In this part of the Canadian analysis status consistency appears to be a relevant attribute in relation to party preference for persons in the low status groups. Whether the data were controlled for occupation, education, or income, the statistically significant relationships were in the lowest status group each time, and in each case the difference between consistent and moderately inconsistent groups was very significant while the difference between the consistent group and either of the sharply inconsistent groups reached statistical significance only once--and that was in the case just reported when controlling for income level.

Status Consistency and Government Involvement Score

The scores on the government involvement index range from "1" which represents the position most opposed to government involvement in economic affairs, and therefore the most conservative position, to score "6" which most favours government participation in economic affairs and therefore represents the most liberal position.

The cross tabulation of the scores on the government involvement index and consistency groups is shown in Table IX. None of the differences between the consistency groups are found to be significant when tested by the Mann Whitney U test. When comparing the consistent and moderately inconsistent groups $z=.94$, $p=.1736$. When the

consistent group is compared to the no like rank group the frequencies are not in a predicted direction. And when comparing consistent and two rank deviate groups, z=1.10, p=.1357.

Table IX

GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT SCORE BY STATUS CONSISTENCY
PERCENT IN EACH POSITION (CANADA)

Score	Consistent	Moderately Inconsistent	Sharply Inconsistent	
			No Like Rank	Two Rank Deviate
1	13.7% (40)	11.4% (64)	10.6% (9)	8.3% (5)
2	22.9% (67)	17.4% (98)	25.9% (22)	13.3% (8)
3	15.0% (44)	22.6% (127)	22.4% (19)	25.0% (15)
4	21.2% (62)	22.6% (127)	27.1% (23)	25.0% (15)
5	16.7% (49)	13.0% (73)	9.4% (8)	20.0% (12)
6	10.6% (31)	13.0% (73)	4.7% (4)	8.3% (5)
TOTAL	100% (293)	100% (562)	100% (85)	100% (60)

The number of cases in each category is in parentheses.
A score of 1 is most opposed to government involvement.
A score of 6 is most in favour of government involvement.

Results of the Mann Whitney U Tests:

Comparing:
Consistent and Moderately Inconsistent z=.94, p=.1736
Consistent and No Like Rank, opposite direction
Consistent and Two Rank Deviate z=1.10, p=.1357

Table X

GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT SCORE BY STATUS CONSISTENCY FOR EACH OCCUPATION LEVEL (CANADA)

Score	Consistent	Moderately Inconsistent	Sharply Inconsistent No Like Rank	Sharply Inconsistent Two Rank Deviate
High Occupation Group				
1	24.1% (7)	14.8% (12)	13.5% (5)	10.8% (4)
2	17.2% (5)	22.2% (18)	35.1% (13)	16.2% (6)
3	24.1% (7)	23.5% (19)	16.2% (6)	27.0% (10)
4	10.3% (3)	22.2% (18)	18.9% (7)	18.9% (7)
5	10.3% (3)	6.2% (5)	5.4% (2)	16.2% (6)
6	13.8% (4)	11.1% (9)	10.8% (4)	10.8% (4)
TOTAL	100% (29)	100% (81)	100% (37)	100% (37)
Middle Occupation Group				
1	7.8% (10)	11.0% (25)	18.8% (3)	
2	24.2% (31)	18.5% (42)	18.8% (3)	
3	12.5% (16)	20.7% (47)	25.0% (4)	
4	21.9% (28)	22.9% (52)	25.0% (4)	
5	21.1% (27)	14.1% (32)	12.5% (2)	
6	12.5% (16)	12.8% (29)	0.0% (0)	
TOTAL	100% (128)	100% (227)	100% (16)	
Low Occupation Group				
1	16.9% (23)	10.6% (27)	3.1% (1)	4.3% (1)
2	22.8% (31)	15.0% (38)	18.8% (6)	8.7% (2)
3	15.4% (21)	24.0% (61)	28.1% (9)	21.7% (5)
4	22.8% (31)	22.4% (57)	37.5% (12)	34.8% (8)
5	14.0% (19)	14.2% (36)	12.5% (4)	26.1% (6)
6	8.1% (11)	13.8% (35)	0.0% (0)	4.3% (1)
TOTAL	100% (136)	100% (254)	100% (32)	100% (23)

The number of cases in each category is in parentheses.
A score of 1 is most opposed to government involvement.
A score of 6 is most in favour of government involvement.

Results of Mann Whitney U Tests:

Comparing:	High Occupation	Middle Occupation	Low Occupation
Consistent with Moderately Inconsistent	z=.42, p=.3372	Opposite Direction	z=2.19, p=.0143
Consistent with No Like Rank	Opposite Direction	Opposite Direction	z=.78, p=.2177
Consistent with Two Rank Deviate	z=1.05, p=.1469		z=1.93, p=.0268

Controls for status level were applied. When controlling for occupation we do not find significant differences in the high occupation group. Comparing the consistents with the moderately inconsistents the differences are not significant. ($z=.42$, $p=.3372$). When consistent and no like rank groups are compared the frequencies are not in the predicted direction. The differences between consistent and two rank deviate groups are not significant. ($z=1.05$, $p=.1469$).

In the middle occupation group the consistents hold the more liberal positions on the government involvement index. In the low occupation group two comparisons reach statistical significance. The difference between consistents and moderately inconsistents is significant, ($z=2.19$, $p=.0143$) and the difference between consistent and two rank deviate groups is significant, ($z=1.93$, $p=.0268$). The difference between consistent and no like rank groups is not significant ($z=.78$, $p=.2177$). Table X sets out the frequencies, percentages, and results of the Mann Whitney U tests.

Table XVII in the Appendix gives the frequencies, percentages, and results of the tests of significance for the data controlled by educational achievement level. In the high educational group the difference between the consistent and two rank deviate groups reaches significance

($z=2.36$, $p=.0091$). One other comparison approaches significance--that between the consistent and moderately inconsistent groups. ($z=1.46$, $p=.0721$). In the middle education group the frequencies are not in the predicted direction. In the low education group the difference between consistent and moderately inconsistent groups approaches significance, ($z=1.39$, $p=.0823$), while the other two comparisons in that group are not in the predicted direction.

Table XVIII in the Appendix presents the data as controlled for each income level, and includes the frequencies and percentages in each position and the results of the tests of significance. In the high income group none of the comparisons reach statistical significance. The difference between the consistent and two rank deviate groups approaches significance ($z=1.38$, $p=.0838$). In the middle income group the frequencies are not in the predicted direction.

In the low income group, the difference between the consistent and moderately inconsistent groups is statistically significant ($z=1.86$, $p=.0314$). The difference between the consistent and two rank deviate groups approaches significance ($z=1.45$, $p=.0735$), while the relationship between the consistent and no like rank groups is not in the predicted direction.

Summary

When consistency types are compared with scores on the government involvement index there are not many differences which reach statistical significance. When controls are applied for income level and occupational prestige level, the significant differences are in the low status groups. These findings are similar to the relationships revealed when party preference was used as an indicator of political attitudes.

Conclusions

Let us summarize the results in view of the hypotheses. The first set of hypotheses have to do with party preference. The null hypothesis states that there is no difference among the four status consistency groups in their support for the liberal parties and the conservative parties.

The results of this analysis lead us to accept the null hypothesis, with some qualification. When degree of consistency is compared to party preference and the data are controlled for occupational, educational, or income status level, the difference between consistents and moderately inconsistents is found to be very significant in each of the low status groups. This finding though not strong enough to reject the null hypothesis is worthy of note. Possible reasons for it will be discussed in

the last chapter.

The second set of hypotheses have to do with supporting the liberal position on the government involvement index. The null hypothesis states that there is no difference among the four status consistency groups in their positions on a liberal-conservative scale or index. When comparing status consistency with score on the government involvement index the significant relationships between consistents and moderately inconsistent appear in the low occupational status group and in the low income group. When controls are applied for educational achievement there is a significant difference between consistents and sharply inconsistents of the two rank deviate type within the high education group. These findings do not show a clear pattern. Therefore the analysis of these data lead us to accept the null hypothesis.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND EVALUATIONS

The formal conclusions of this empirical study will center around the hypotheses. It will be recalled that there were two major sets of hypotheses relating status consistency to political attitudes as measured by two indicators.

The first set of hypotheses was concerned with the relationship of status consistency to political attitudes as measured by vote and/or party preference. The first null hypothesis stated: there is no difference among the four status consistency groups in their support for the liberal party or parties and the conservative party or parties.

In the Dunedin study, when the general comparison was made between the status consistency groups on the proportion voting for the Labour (liberal) party, no significant differences were found. (Table III, page 57). When the data were further analyzed to control for occupational, educational, and residencial status levels there was a significant difference between the consistents and the sharply inconsistents in each of the high status levels. Tables IV, XI, and XII report the relevant details. This paucity of significant differences leads us to accept the null hypothesis.

Turning to the Canadian survey, in the general comparison between status consistency groups and the proportion voting for the liberal parties one significant difference was found. The difference between the consistent and moderately inconsistent groups was significant. When controls were applied for status level this significant relationship disappeared except in the low occupation, low education, and low income groups. When the data were controlled for occupation and education the significant difference was between the consistent and moderately inconsistent groups. When it was controlled for income level there were significant differences between the consistent and moderately inconsistent groups and between the consistents and the sharply inconsistents of the two rank deviate type. Tables VII, VIII, XV, and XVI report the relevant details. No other comparisons approached significance. In many cases the consistents were more likely to favour the liberal parties, which is opposite to the hypothesis. Once again the small minority of significant differences leads us to accept the null hypothesis.

The limited findings reported above are not very stable cross nationally. In the case of the New Zealand data the significant differences are found in the high status levels only, while in the case of the Canadian

survey data the significant differences are found in the low status levels only. These contradictory limitations increase our acceptance of the null hypothesis.

In the second set of hypotheses the null hypothesis states that there is no difference among the four status consistency groups as to their positions on a liberal-conservative scale or index.

In the Dunedin study status consistency was compared to position on a two item scale measuring liberalism-conservatism. In the general comparison there was a significant difference between the consistent and moderately inconsistent groups. When controls for status level were applied the significant differences were erratic as will now be described.

When controlled for occupational prestige the difference between consistent and moderately inconsistent groups was significant in the low occupation level. When the data were controlled for education, the difference between consistents and sharply inconsistents of the no like rank type was significant in the high education group. When the data were controlled by dwelling area, the differences between consistents and sharply inconsistents (no like rank and two rank deviate groups) were statistically significant in the high dwelling area prestige group. Tables V, VI, XIII, and XIV summarize

relevant details.

As no comparisons survive the controls for status level and the significant differences that do appear within the various status levels do not show a pattern it is necessary to accept the null hypothesis.

In the Canadian survey, the original comparison between consistency and score on the government involvement index revealed no significant differences. When controls for status level were applied the significant differences were erratic in a different way than the ones found in the New Zealand study.

When the data were controlled for occupation level, the differences between consistent and moderately inconsistent groups, and consistents and sharply inconsistents of the two rank deviate type were statistically significant within the low occupation level only. When income level is controlled the only significant difference was between consistent and moderately inconsistent groups in the low income level. When education is controlled the significant difference is in the high education group and it is between the consistents and the two rank deviate type of sharply inconsistents. Tables IX, X, XVII, and XVIII summarize the relevant details.

Again, in each study the findings force us to accept the null hypothesis. The differences that are found

among the consistency groups on their score for liberalism-conservatism move from the high level to the low level without logic thus giving us no basis to indicate even a pattern for qualification.

Some possible explanations

When vote or party preference is used as an indicator of economic liberalism a consistent pattern of relationship appears within each of the studies.

In the Dunedin Central study the sharply inconsistents within the high status groups are more likely to vote for the Labour party. Could the reason for this be that while they are high on one rank, at least one of their other ranks must be in the lowest status group? Since status itself is related to voting behavior one would expect this one low status rank to lead to a more liberal vote. Conversely in the low status groups the difference between the consistents and the sharply inconsistents is very great. The sharply inconsistent group is much more in favour of the National party. This leads us to think that it could be the influence of the higher ranks held by those inconsistents that tend to make them vote more conservatively than the consistents in the low group.

The analysis of the Dunedin Central data, relating status level to vote reveals a clear linear relationship. The higher the status level the higher the proportion voting

for the National party.[1] This relationship is not unexpected but is emphasized here because it is so strong that its influence appears through an analysis of status consistency.

Looking at the Canadian data with a view to recognizing the effects of status level, the relation between status level and party preference was analyzed. When status level is measured on the occupation and income dimension, the middle status levels hold the most liberal positions. The high status levels are only slightly less liberal. This liberal characteristic of the middle status levels may explain why most of the significant relationships in the low status levels are between the consistent and moderately inconsistent groups. Whatever other ranks they have, moderately inconsistents always have at least one middle rank. The effect of status rank as such is less clear in the Canadian analysis than in the Dunedin analysis.

If we consider the question, "Which is the better indicator of political attitudes, status consistency or status level?", we must conclude that in the Dunedin study, status level, per se, is a more powerful and reliable indicator than status consistency. In the Canadian study, neither

---

[1] Austin Mitchell, "Dunedin Central", Political Science, 14:80, March 1962. The comparisons carried out for this research confirm the findings reported by Dr. Mitchell.

one is very reliable.

Reference group theory suggests that individuals choose a group to emulate, to aspire to, or to use as a model for different kinds of behavior. The above findings may be seen as an expression of reference group behavior, especially the findings of the Dunedin Central study.

By definition those sharply inconsistent in each of the high status groups have lower status positions in one or two of the other hierarchies while those in the consistent group are high in all three status hierarchies. And the sharply inconsistent in each of the low groups have high status positions in one or two of the other hierarchies while those in the consistent group will be low on all three.

In each case the inconsistents may be centering on one of their other ranks, using it as a reference group. We do not yet understand the factors which operate in the selection of a reference group. In the context of this study, why do some inconsistent individuals select behavior characteristics of groups which can be identified with their lower ranks while others center on their higher ranks? The concept of status consistency, as defined and measured in this research, does not provide an answer.

Recommendations for Further Research

Some of the assumptions in the study of status inconsistency and political attitudes would lend themselves well to

methodological study. In measuring status consistency each investigator has selected several hierarchies on the basis of availability and his judgement as to their relative importance in society.

Each combination of status hierarchies is potentially relevant to a specific behavior. We have reason to believe that some combinations are more meaningful than others. The functional and temporal interrelationships of the attributes education, occupation, and income make it a particularly useful combination worthy of further study. When attributes are so closely associated, we would expect any inconsistency among them to be stressful. If an ascribed status such as race is included among the hierarchies the inconsistency then describes the differences between that ascribed status which is fixed and the achieved statuses which can be changed. A methodological study of inconsistency using different combinations of hierarchies would be worthwhile to clarify these interrelationships.

As was indicated in the theoretical chapter the concepts of vertical mobility and status inconsistency are closely linked. The prevalence of inconsistency is due largely to rising and falling within the different hierarchies. It is logical therefore to suggest that consideration of vertical mobility be included in further study of status inconsistency.

In his article, "The Mobility Dimension of Status Consistency", Milton Bloombaum[1] suggests that inconsistent patterns be characterized according to whether they are the result of upward mobility or downward mobility. He presents a paradigm for studying this interrelationship. The paradigm calls for twelve categories for the inconsistent patterns. The consistent patterns would require four categories if worked out along the same lines. The above categories do not have a place for the cases whose pattern of consistency or inconsistency is not the result of mobility. As most people do not make large changes in their status positions there would be many cases of this type.

The caution to be voiced here is the danger of developing such a large number of categories that a very large sample and complicated analysis would be required to test the hypotheses.

The experience of using two indicators of political liberalism in each study emphasizes the importance of definition and generalization. Vote and party preference seem to be more reliable indicators than the other measures.

---

[1] Milton Bloombaum, "The Mobility Dimension in Status Consistency", Sociology and Social Research, 48:340-347, April 1964.

It stands to reason that party loyalty and voting patterns are more stable than the response to an opinion question or statement which the interviewee may never have thought about previously.

Doing two secondary analyses in two different countries has been useful in pointing out the different results that can be obtained even while many aspects of the analysis were the same. The nature of the original survey in each case was different, but the data underwent approximately the same treatment in analysis and the results were dramatically different. This is good evidence of the need for many tests of a given hypothesis to verify its applicability to more than the specific situation of one study. The proposition that the more status inconsistent a person is, the more liberal will be his political attitudes did not survive these two studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Stuart, "Status Congruency as a Variable in Small Group Performance", Social Forces, 32:16-22, 1953.

Afsaruddin, M., "A Status Crystallization and Psychological Behavior", Journal of the Pakistan Academy for Rural Development, (Comilla), 3:249-270, April 1963.

Alford, R.R., Party and Society, The Anglo American Democracies, London, John Murray, 1964, 396 pp.

Anderson, Bo and Morris Zelditch Jr., "Rank Equilibration and Politics", European Journal of Sociology, 5:112-125, 1964.

Barber, Bernard, Social Stratification A Comparative Analysis of Structure and Process, New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1957, 540 pp.

Benoit-Smullyan, Emile, "Status, Status Types and Status Interrelations", American Sociological Review, 9:151-161, April 1944.

Bloombaum, Milton, "The Mobility Dimension in Status Consistency", Sociology and Social Research, 48:340-347, April 1964.

Brandmeyer, Gerard, "Status Consistency and Political Behavior: A Replication and Extension of Research", Sociological Quarterly, 6:241-256, Summer 1965.

Broom, Leonard, "Social Differentiation and Stratification" in Sociology Today, Robert K. Merton et.al Editors, New York, Basic Books, 1959, p.429-441.

Congalton, A.A., and R.J. Havighurst, "Status Ranking of Occupations in New Zealand", Australian Journal of Psychology, 6:10-16, June 1954.

Duncan, Otis Dudley, "A Socioeconomic Index for All Occupations" in Occupations and Social Status by Albert J. Reiss, Jr., et.al., New York, The Free Press of Glencoe Inc., 1961, p.109-138.

Exline, R.V. and R.C. Ziller, "Status Congruency and Interpersonal Conflict in Decision Making Groups", Human Relations, 12:147-162, April 1959.

Fenchel, G.H., J.H. Monderer and E.L. Hartley, "Subjective Status and the Equilibrium Hypothesis", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 46:476-479, October 1951.

Gerth, H.H. and C.W. Mills, Translators and Editors, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, New York, Oxford University Press, 1958, 490 pp.

Gibbs, Jack P. and Walter T. Martin, Status Integration and Suicide, A Sociological Study, Eugene, University of Oregon Press, 1964, 225 pp.

Goffman, Irwin, "Status Consistency and Preference for Change in Power Distribution", American Sociological Review, 22:275-281, June 1957.

Gold, R., "Janitors vs Tenants: A Status-Income Dilemma", American Journal of Sociology, 57:486-493, March 1952.

Hodge, Robert W., "Status Consistency of Occupational Groups", American Sociological Review, 27:336-343, June 1962.

Homans, George Caspar, Social Behavior Its Elementary Forms, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961, 404 pp.

Inkeles, Alex and Peter H. Rossi, "National Comparisons of Occupational Prestige", American Journal of Sociology, 61:329-339, 1956.

Jackson, E.F., "Status Consistency and Symptoms of Stress", American Sociological Review, 27:469-480, August 1962.

Jackson, E.F. and Peter J. Burke, "Status and Symptoms of Stress: Additive and Interaction Effects", American Sociological Review, 30:556-564, August 1965.

Kenkel, William F., "Relationship between Status Consistency and Politico-Economic Attitudes", American Sociological Review, 21:365-368, June 1956.

Kelly, K. Dennis and William J. Chambliss, "Status Consistency and Political Attitudes", American Sociological Review, 31:375-382, June 1966.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Morris Rosenberg, Editors, Language of Social Research, A Reader in the Methodology of Social Research, Glencoe Illinois, The Free Press, 1955, 590 pp.

Lenski, Gerhard, "Comment on Kenkel's Communication", American Sociological Review, 21:368-369, June 1956.

Lenski, Gerhard, "Social Participation and Status Crystallization", American Sociological Review, 21: 458-464, August 1956.

Lenski, Gerhard, "Status Crystallization, A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status", American Sociological Review, 19: 405-413, August 1954.

Lipset, Seymour Martin, "Democracy and Working Class Authoritarianism", American Sociological Review, 24:482-501, August 1959.

Lipset, Seymour Martin and Reinhard Bendix, Social Mobility in Industrial Society, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1959, 309 pp.

Miller, S.M., "Comparative Social Mobility", Current Sociology, 9:1-89, 1960.

Mitchell, Austin, "Dunedin Central", Political Science, 14: 27-80, March 1962.

Mitchell, Robert E., "Methodological Notes on a Theory of Status Crystallization", Public Opinion Quarterly, 28:315-325, Summer 1964.

Nam, Charles B. and Mary G. Powers, "Variations in Socio-economic Structure by Race, Residence, and the Life Cycle", American Sociological Review, 30: 97-103, February 1965.

New Zealand Official Yearbook, 1965, 70th Issue, Department of Statistics, Wellington, New Zealand.

Parsons, Talcott, "An Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification", in Essays in Sociological Theory, Revised Edition, The Free Press, Glencoe Illinois, 1954, p.69-88.

Paul, John and Jerome Laulicht, In Your Opinion, Leaders' and Voters' Attitudes on Defense and Disarmament, Canadian Peach Research Institute, 1963, 140 pp.

Pellegrin, R.J. and F.L. Bates, "Congruity and Incongruity of Status Attributes within Occupations and Work Positions", Social Forces, 38:23-28, October 1959.

Powers, Mary G., "Socioeconomic Status and the Fertility of Married Women", Sociology and Social Research, 50:472-482, July 1966.

Reiss, Albert J., et.al., Occupations and Social Status, New York, The Free Press of Glencoe Inc., 1961, 305 pp.

Sampson, Edward E., "Status Congruence and Cognitive Consistency", Sociometry, 26:146-162, June 1963.

Schmitt, David R., "An Attitudinal Correlate of the Status Congruence of Married Women", Social Forces, 44:190-195, December 1965.

Siegel, Sidney, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956, 301 pp.

Warner, W. Lloyd, M. Meeker and K. Eells, Social Class in America: A Manual for Procedure for the Measurement of Social Status, Chicago, Science Research Associates, 1949, 275 pp.

Young, Michael, The Rise of the Meritocracy, Penguin, 1961, 190 pp.

Table XI

PERCENTAGE OF LABOUR VOTE BY CONSISTENCY
FOR EACH EDUCATION LEVEL (Dunedin Central)

Education Group	Degree of Status Consistency		
	Consistent	Moderately Inconsistent	Sharply Inconsistent[1]
High	12.2% N=41	25.3% N=71 X^2=2.00, $p < .10 > .05$[2]	48.0% N=23 X^2=8.16, $p < .005$
Middle	50.0% N=42	51.6% N=126	75.0% N=20 X^2=2.52, $p < .10 > .05$
Low	81.6% N=38	69.6% N=102	42.0% N=38

1 When the two sharply inconsistent groups are in the same directional relationship to the consistent and moderately inconsistent groups they are combined.

2 Each X^2 refers to a comparison with the consistent group. With each X^2 there is one degree of freedom. A one tail test of significance is used as each hypothesis is directional.

Table XII

PERCENTAGE OF LABOUR VOTE BY CONSISTENCY FOR EACH LEVEL OF DWELLING AREA PRESTIGE (Dunedin Central)

Dwelling Area Group	Degree of Status Consistency		
	Consistent	Moderately Inconsistent	Sharply Inconsistent[1]
High	12.2% N=41	23.2% N=69 X^2=1.36, $p < .15 > .10$[2]	52.0% N=50 X^2=14.16, $p < .0005$
Middle	50.0% N=42	56.9% N=195 X^2=.42, $p < .35 > .25$	62.5% N=8 X^2=.068, $p < .40 > .35$
Low	31.6% N=38	77.1% N=35	48.0% N=23

1 When the two sharply inconsistent groups are in the same directional relationship to the consistent and moderately inconsistent groups they are combined.

2 Each X^2 refers to a comparison with the consistent group. With each X^2 there is one degree of freedom. A one tail test of significance is used as each hypothesis is directional.

Table XIII

LIBERAL-CONSERVATIVE SCORE BY STATUS CONSISTENCY FOR EACH EDUCATION LEVEL (Dunedin Central)

Scale Score	Consistent	Moderately Inconsistent	Sharply Inconsistent No Like Rank	Sharply Inconsistent Two Rank Deviate
High Education Group				
2	13.3% (4)	15.7% (8)	43.0% (3)	22.2% (2)
3	10.0% (3)	3.9% (2)	28.5% (2)	11.1% (1)
5	13.3% (4)	29.4% (15)	0% (0)	22.2% (2)
6	63.4% (19)	51.0% (26)	28.5% (2)	44.5% (4)
TOTAL	100% (30)	100% (51)	100% (7)	100% (9)
Middle Education Group				
2	24.2% (7)	37.0% (27)	42.8% (6)	
3	20.7% (6)	10.9% (8)	14.3% (2)	
5	6.9% (2)	19.2% (14)	7.2% (1)	
6	48.2% (14)	32.9% (24)	35.7% (5)	
TOTAL	100% (29)	100% (73)	100% (14)	
Low Education Group				
2	30.0% (6)	41.9% (31)	30.0% (3)	35.7% (5)
3	15.0% (3)	17.5% (13)	0% (0)	7.1% (1)
5	10.0% (2)	12.2% (9)	10.0% (1)	28.6% (4)
6	45.0% (9)	28.4% (21)	60.0% (6)	28.6% (4)
TOTAL	100% (20)	100% (74)	100% (10)	100% (14)

The number of cases in each category is in parentheses. Score 2 is most liberal, score 6 is most conservative. Score 4 was dropped as it represented ambiguity or no opinion.

Results of Mann Whitney U Tests

Comparing:	High Education	Middle Education	Low Education
Consistent with Moderately Inconsistent	z=.68 p=.2483	z=1.18 p=.1190	z=1.23 p=.1093
Consistent with No Like Rank	z=1.82 p=.0344	z=.985 p=.1611	Opposite Direction
Consistent with Two Rank Deviate	z=.85 p=.1977		U=155.5 p > .05

Table XIV

LIBERAL-CONSERVATIVE SCORE BY STATUS CONSISTENCY FOR EACH DWELLING AREA PRESTIGE GROUP (Dunedin Central)

Scale Score	Consistent	Moderately Inconsistent	Sharply Inconsistent No Like Rank	Sharply Inconsistent Two Rank Deviate
High Prestige Area				
2	13.3% (4)	12.2% (5)	45.0% (9)	40.0% (6)
3	10.0% (3)	4.9% (2)	5.0% (1)	6.6% (1)
5	13.3% (4)	31.7% (13)	5.0% (1)	26.7% (4)
6	63.4% (19)	51.2% (21)	45.0% (9)	26.7% (4)
TOTAL	100% (30)	100% (41)	100% (20)	100% (15)
Middle Prestige Area				
2	24.2% (7)	38.0% (52)	0% (0)	
3	20.7% (6)	12.4% (17)	0% (0)	
5	6.9% (2)	15.3% (21)	0% (0)	
6	48.2% (14)	34.3% (47)	100% (1)	
TOTAL	100% (29)	100% (137)	100% (1)	
Low Prestige Area				
2	30.0% (6)	45.0% (9)	27.3% (3)	12.5% (1)
3	15.0% (3)	20.0% (4)	27.3% (3)	12.5% (1)
5	10.0% (2)	20.0% (4)	9.1% (1)	25.0% (2)
6	45.0% (9)	15.0% (3)	36.3% (4)	50.0% (4)
TOTAL	100% (20)	100% (20)	100% (11)	100% (8)

The number of cases in each category is in parentheses. Score 2 is most liberal, score 6 most conservative. Score 4 was dropped as it represented ambiguity or no opinion.

Results of Mann Whitney U Tests

Comparing:	High Area	Middle Area	Low Area
Consistent with Moderately Inconsistent	z=.537 p=.2946	z=.41 p=.3409	U=256.5 p > .05
Consistent with No Like Rank	z=1.64 p=.0505	Opposite Direction	U=112 p > .05
Consistent with Two Rank Deviate	z=2.15 p=.0158		Opposite Direction

Table XV

PERCENTAGE OF PREFERENCE FOR THE LIBERAL PARTIES BY CONSISTENCY FOR EACH EDUCATION LEVEL (CANADA)

Education Group	Consistent	Moderately Inconsistent	Sharply Inconsistent	
			No Like Rank	Two Rank Deviate
High	66% N=18	59% N=46	37% N=8	66% N=18
Middle	57% N=77	57% N=219	48% N=23	not possible
Low	31% N=81	57% N=98 $X^2=11.89$, $p<.0005$[1]	37% N=19 $X^2=.05$, $p<.45>.40$	30% N=20

[1] Each X^2 refers to a comparison with the consistent group. With each X^2 there is one degree of freedom. A one tail test of significance is used as each hypothesis is directional.

Table XVI

PERCENTAGE OF PREFERENCE FOR THE LIBERAL PARTIES BY CONSISTENCY FOR EACH INCOME LEVEL (CANADA)

Income Group	Consistent	Moderately Inconsistent	Sharply Inconsistent	
			No Like Rank	Two Rank Deviate
High	66% N=18	55% N=60	47% N=17	33% N=12
Middle	57% N=77	62% N=186 X^2=.42, p <.35 >.25[1]	37% N=19	Not possible
Low	31% N=81	50% N=117 X^2=6.71, p <.005	43% N=14 X^2=.33 p <.35 >.25	54% N=26 X^2=3.55 p <.05

[1] Each X^2 refers to a comparison with the consistent group. With each X^2 there is one degree of freedom. A one tail test of significance is used as each hypothesis is directional.

Table XVII

GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT SCORE BY STATUS CONSISTENCY FOR EACH EDUCATION LEVEL (CANADA)

Score	Consistent	Moderately Inconsistent	Sharply Inconsistent No Like Rank	Sharply Inconsistent Two Rank Deviate
High Education Group				
1	24.1% (7)	6.7% (4)	13.3% (2)	0.0% (0)
2	17.2% (5)	16.7% (10)	26.7% (4)	9.1% (2)
3	24.1% (7)	25.0% (15)	13.3% (2)	18.2% (4)
4	10.3% (3)	28.3% (17)	26.7% (4)	31.8% (7)
5	10.3% (3)	15.0% (9)	20.0% (3)	31.8% (7)
6	13.8% (4)	8.3% (5)	0.0% (0)	9.1% (2)
TOTAL	100% (29)	100% (60)	100% (15)	100% (22)
Middle Education Group				
1	7.8% (10)	11.8% (40)	2.4% (1)	
2	24.2% (31)	16.5% (56)	29.3% (12)	
3	12.5% (16)	22.7% (77)	29.3% (12)	
4	21.9% (28)	23.6% (80)	24.4% (10)	
5	21.1% (27)	12.7% (43)	4.9% (2)	
6	12.5% (16)	12.7% (43)	9.8% (4)	
TOTAL	100% (128)	100% (339)	100% (41)	
Low Education Group				
1	16.9% (23)	12.3% (20)	20.7% (6)	13.2% (5)
2	22.8% (31)	19.6% (32)	20.7% (6)	15.8% (6)
3	15.4% (21)	21.5% (35)	17.2% (5)	28.9% (11)
4	22.8% (31)	18.4% (30)	31.0% (9)	21.1% (8)
5	14.0% (19)	12.9% (21)	10.3% (3)	13.2% (5)
6	8.1% (11)	15.3% (25)	0.0% (0)	7.9% (3)
TOTAL	100% (136)	100% (163)	100% (29)	100% (38)

The number of cases in each category is in parentheses.
A score of 1 is most opposed to government involvement.
A score of 6 is most in favour of government involvement.

Results of Mann Whitney U Tests:

Comparing:	High Education	Middle Education	Low Education
Consistent with Moderately Inconsistent	z=1.46, p=.0721	Opposite Direction	z=1.39, p=.0823
Consistent with No Like Rank	z=.27, p=.3936	Opposite Direction	Opposite Direction
Consistent with Two Rank Deviate	z=2.36, p=.0091		Opposite Direction

Table XVIII

GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT SCORE BY STATUS CONSISTENCY FOR EACH INCOME LEVEL (CANADA)

Score	Consistent	Moderately Inconsistent	Sharply Inconsistent No Like Rank	Sharply Inconsistent Two Rank Deviate
High Income Group				
1	24.1% (7)	15.2% (14)	6.1% (2)	5.3% (1)
2	17.2% (5)	21.7% (20)	15.2% (5)	10.5% (2)
3	24.1% (7)	21.7% (20)	33.3% (11)	26.3% (5)
4	10.3% (3)	20.7% (19)	36.4% (12)	36.8% (7)
5	10.3% (3)	12.0% (11)	9.1% (3)	15.8% (3)
6	13.8% (4)	8.7% (8)	0.0% (0)	5.3% (1)
TOTAL	100% (29)	100% (92)	100% (33)	100% (19)
Middle Income Group				
1	7.8% (10)	10.2% (29)	17.9% (5)	
2	24.2% (31)	18.0% (51)	25.0% (7)	
3	12.5% (16)	22.5% (64)	10.7% (3)	
4	21.9% (28)	21.1% (60)	32.1% (9)	
5	21.1% (27)	13.7% (39)	14.3% (4)	
6	12.5% (16)	14.4% (41)	0.0% (0)	
TOTAL	100% (128)	100% (284)	100% (28)	
Low Income Group				
1	16.9% (23)	11.3% (21)	8.3% (2)	9.8% (4)
2	22.8% (31)	14.5% (27)	41.7% (10)	14.6% (6)
3	15.4% (21)	23.1% (43)	20.8% (5)	24.4% (10)
4	22.8% (31)	25.8% (48)	8.3% (2)	19.5% (8)
5	14.0% (19)	12.4% (23)	4.2% (1)	22.0% (9)
6	8.1% (11)	12.9% (24)	16.7% (4)	9.8% (4)
TOTAL	100% (136)	100% (186)	100% (24)	100% (41)

The number of cases in each category is in parentheses.
A score of 1 is most opposed to government involvement.
A score of 6 is most in favour of government involvement.

Results of Mann Whitney U Test:

	High Income	Middle Income	Low Income
Comparing: Consistent with Moderately Inconsistent	z=.47, p=.3192	Opposite Direction	z=1.86, p=.0314
Consistent with No Like Rank	z=.88, p=.1894	Opposite Direction	Opposite Direction
Consistent with Two Rank Deviate	z=1.38, p=.0838		z=1.45, p=.0735